

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

that remained as a party in those actions. Those actions were captioned *Maryland Casualty Co. v. W. R. Grace & Co.*, 88 CIV 4337, filed in 1988, and *Continental Casualty Company v. W. R. Grace & Co. and W. R. Grace & Co. Conn.*, 00 CIV 4524, filed in 2000. The *Maryland Casualty* action involved approximately 200 claims arising from environmental contamination of sites owned or once owned by certain of the Debtors and off-site, non-owned disposal sites. The *Continental Casualty* action involved approximately 45 claims of the same nature, including the Debtors' claims for coverage regarding certain former vermiculite mining operations in Libby, Montana. The confidential settlement agreement between the Debtors and *Continental Casualty Company* was finalized in December 2004. On March 15, 2005, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order approving the settlement. The settlement agreement resolved all of the claims at issue in the *Maryland Casualty* action and that action was dismissed with prejudice. The settlement agreement also resolved all of the claims at issue in the *Continental Casualty* action, with the exception of assertions of coverage for premises personal injury claims, including but not limited to, claims for coverage for wrongful death, *per quod*, and fear of cancer claims arising from Grace-related business operations in Libby, Montana ("Libby-Related Claims"). The *Continental Casualty* action has not been dismissed, but rather was closed on the trial court's active docket shortly after the Debtors sought bankruptcy protection. At such time as the automatic stay arising from the Debtors' bankruptcy is lifted with respect to the *Continental Casualty* action, the parties will be free to reopen that action on the active docket and further litigate their respective rights and obligations with respect to the Libby-Related Claims or take other action.

The third environmental insurance coverage action was captioned *Unigard Security Ins. Co. v. W. R. Grace & Co.-Conn. and W. R. Grace & Co.* (Case No. 97-cv-08941) and was filed in 1997 in the Southern District of New York federal district court. In this suit, Unigard sought a declaration of no liability regarding potential bodily injury claims against certain of the Debtors arising from environmental contamination at four sites formerly owned by certain of the Debtors. The *Unigard* action was stayed as a result of the Debtors' bankruptcy. On March 8, 2002, the federal district court noted that the claims in the case were dormant, and the court's docket entries indicate that the case was closed on the active docket as of March 8, 2002. The Unigard policy at issue is a first-layer excess policy that was in effect from June 30, 1974 to June 30, 1975, with limits of \$10,000,000. Additionally, in June 2003, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, while interpreting coverage under the *Continental Casualty Policy* underlying the Unigard policy, held that section 46 of the New York Insurance Law, which was in effect from 1971 to 1982, prohibits coverage for claims arising from gradual pollution.

2.8.4 Fraudulent Transfer Litigation

In September 2000, the Parent and certain of its subsidiaries were named in a purported class action lawsuit filed in California Superior Court for the County of San Francisco, alleging that the 1996 reorganization involving a predecessor of the Parent and Fresenius AG and the 1998 reorganization involving a predecessor of the Parent and Sealed Air were fraudulent transfers (*Abner, et al., v. W. R. Grace & Co., et al.*). The District Court authorized the Asbestos PI Committee and Asbestos PD Committee to proceed with claims against Fresenius and Sealed Air on behalf of the Debtors' bankruptcy estates. On March 18, 2002 the Asbestos PI Committee and the Asbestos PD Committee filed the Sealed Air Action (Adv. Pro. No. 02-2210)

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

and the Fresenius Action (Adv. Pro. No. 02-2211) on behalf of the Debtors' estates asserting asbestos, successor liability, and fraudulent transfer claims.

In November 2002, Fresenius and Sealed Air each announced that they had reached agreements in principle with the Asbestos PI Committee and Asbestos PD Committee to settle the Sealed Air Action and the Fresenius Action. On June 25, 2003, the District Court approved the Fresenius Settlement Agreement. Subject to certain conditions (including, without limitation, the provision of injunctions and releases in favor of Fresenius), Fresenius will pay \$115 million to the Debtors' estates as directed by the Bankruptcy Court upon confirmation of the Plan. The Bankruptcy Court approved the Sealed Air Settlement Agreement by order dated June 27, 2005 (Docket No. 8742). Under the terms of the Sealed Air Settlement Agreement and subject to the fulfillment of certain conditions (including, without limitation, the provision of injunctions and releases in favor of the Sealed Air Indemnified Parties), Cryovac, Inc. will transfer a total of \$512.5 million in Cash (plus interest at 5.5% compounded annually, commencing on December 21, 2002) and 9 million shares (now 18 million shares to reflect a two-for-one stock split) of Sealed Air Common Stock directly to the Asbestos PI Trust and the Asbestos PD Trust, as directed by the Bankruptcy Court upon confirmation of the Plan. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Cryovac Payment remains subject to adjustment, including by virtue of any setoff rights that Sealed Air has under the Settlement Agreement. To date, Sealed Air has neither exercised nor waived any such setoff rights, but may exercise such rights in the future. Assuming that no adjustment is made, the Cryovac Payment is collectively valued at \$1,031.2 million (as of June 30, 2008). One of the purposes of the Plan is to effectuate and comply with the terms of the Sealed Air Settlement Agreement.

2.8.5 Tax Claims

2.8.5.1 IRS Proposed Tax Adjustments

With respect to the 1993-1996 federal income tax audit, there is one issue outstanding relating to approximately \$7 million of research and experimentation credits claimed for the 1993-1996 taxable years on which the IRS and certain of the Debtors have reached a settlement. The settlement will result in a refund of tax of approximately \$6.3 million plus interest. The Bankruptcy Court entered an order on July 21, 2008 approving the settlement (Docket No. 19111) and the settlement has been approved by the Joint Committee on Taxation.

With respect to the 1997-2001 federal income tax audit, the Debtors have received revised examination reports from the IRS, which include the review of losses carried back to 1988-1989 (collectively, the "Examination Reports") asserting, in the aggregate, approximately \$32.5 million of net additional tax plus accrued interest. The most significant issue addressed in the Examination Reports concerns the carryback of a specified liability loss from the 1998 tax period to the 1989 taxable year. On March 22, 2007, certain of the Debtors received a Notice of Deficiency with respect to the carryback of the specified liability loss and certain other issues. Certain of the Debtors filed a petition in the United States Tax Court to resolve the issues relating to the Notice of Deficiency. On December 10, 2007, the Tax Court granted the parties' motion to forward the case to the IRS Appeals Office for the purposes of conducting settlement negotiations. This case will not result in any cash taxes payable by the Debtors because the

Debtors have other refund claims pending unrelated to this issue, which amount will not be paid by the IRS until this matter is resolved.

There are currently several IRS Claims pending against the Debtors, including one for approximately \$311 million in federal income taxes relating to the 1988 through 2001 tax periods. The Debtors estimate their liability for this Claim to be zero as a result of the various refunds owing to the Debtors and other matters outlined herein. Otherwise, all tax issues for the 1988 through 2001 tax periods have been resolved through settlements and related payments that have been approved by the Bankruptcy Court.

2.8.5.2 Bekaert Textiles N.V.

Under an indemnification agreement, certain of the Debtors are responsible for defense costs and payment of any tax assessments levied by the Belgian government on a former subsidiary, Bekaert Textiles N.V. ("Bekaert"), in connection with foreign bond transactions in 1989 and 1990. Shortly after receipt of the assessments, Bekaert filed tax protests with the Belgian taxing authority, which failed to act on the protests. To stop the running of interest, Bekaert commenced litigation in 2001 against the Belgian government on the issue, which is pending. The total amount allegedly owed for taxes and interest is approximately 462,607,092 BEF (approximately \$18 million USD as of June 16, 2008). Such Belgium proceedings are not affected by the automatic stay of the Chapter 11 Cases.

2.8.5.3 State Income Tax Claims

Certain state income tax Claims relating to past tax years may involve significant amounts. Although state income tax proofs of Claim have been filed against certain of the Debtors in the amount of approximately \$44 million, the Debtors estimate that they will have to pay out approximately \$33 million. Of the \$33 million, the Debtors estimate that they will be required to pay \$12.5 million in state taxes and \$20.5 million in interest accrued to the Petition Date.

2.9 Liabilities Other than Litigation Claims

2.9.1 Current Liabilities not Subject to Compromise Under the Bankruptcy Code

As of June 30, 2008, the Debtors had approximately \$669.6 million in current liabilities not subject to compromise under the Bankruptcy Code. This amount represents the sum of short-term debt, income taxes, and trade and other operating liabilities that are due or will become payable within one year after June 30, 2008. These liabilities are expected to be satisfied in accordance with their terms.

2.9.2 Non-Current Liabilities not Subject to Compromise Under the Bankruptcy Code

As of June 30, 2008, the Debtors had approximately \$461.8 million in non-current liabilities not subject to compromise under the Bankruptcy Code. This amount consists of \$35.0 million of deferred income taxes, \$312.2 million of liabilities related to the Debtors' defined-benefit pension plans, \$51.6 million in other non-current liabilities, \$62.7 million of

minority interest in consolidated entities and \$0.3 million in long-term debt. These liabilities relate to obligations that arose subsequent to the Debtors' Chapter 11 Cases and will be satisfied in accordance with their terms.

2.9.3 Liabilities Subject to Compromise Under the Bankruptcy Code

2.9.3.1 Debt and Accrued Interest

As of June 30, 2008, as recorded on the Debtors' books, there was approximately \$834.6 million of debt and accrued interest. This amount consists of \$500 million under the Debtors' Pre-petition Credit Facilities (Class 9) plus \$25.7 million under drawn letters of credit and other debt (\$1.5 million Class 2 and \$24.2 million Class 9). This amount also includes \$3.8 million of interest relating to such letters of credit calculated at 4.19%, compounded annually.²⁰ The Plan provides for interest at a rate of 6.09%, from the Petition Date through December 31, 2005 and thereafter at floating prime, in each case compounded quarterly, for obligations under the Debtors' Pre-petition Credit Facilities, which results in total accrued interest of approximately \$305.1 million as of June 30, 2008.

By letter dated April 21, 2008, certain holders (the "Objecting Lenders") of claims outstanding under the Debtors' Pre-petition Credit Facilities (the "Lender Claims") demanded that payment on the Lender Claims include post-petition interest at 100% of the contractual default rate, compounded quarterly, plus facility fees and other fees due and attorneys' fees and costs. On June 13, 2008, the Debtors filed an objection to the Lender Claims seeking an order from the Bankruptcy Court that post-petition interest at the contract default rate need not be paid in connection with Lender Claims (Docket No. 18922). The Objecting Lenders and the Unsecured Creditors' Committee, joined by JPMorgan Chase Bank N.A. ("JPMorgan"), in its capacity as agent for all pre-petition lenders (the "Lenders"), responded to and opposed the Debtors' claim objection. (Docket Nos. 19072, 19073, and 19074). The matter was heard by the Bankruptcy Court on September 29, 2008 and the Bankruptcy Court's ruling is pending. For a more detailed discussion of this litigation, *see infra* section 3.2.8.4 (Bank Claims Default Interest Litigation).

2.9.3.2 Income Taxes

As of June 30, 2008, the Debtors have established approximately \$100.8 million in reserves, for financial reporting purposes, for potential income taxes and related statutory interest (\$30,000 Administrative Expenses, \$33.4 million Priority Tax, \$200,000 Class 2 and \$67.2 million Class 9). This amount reflects the Debtors' estimated liability for domestic and foreign uncertain income tax positions.

²⁰ Pursuant to Plan Sections 3.1.9 (d) and (e), the Plan provides procedures whereby the Holders of Class 9 Claims, other than the Holders of the Lenders' Claims, may request a determination of whether they are entitled to post-petition interest at a rate or calculation other than the treatment provided for in the Plan. *See* Section 4.3.1.9 herein for a further discussion of these procedures.

2.9.3.3 Post-Retirement Benefits Other than Pensions

As of June 30, 2008, the Debtors had approximately \$70.9 million in liabilities relating to post-retirement benefits other than pensions. This amount represents the present value of the Debtors' estimated future annual obligations under their retiree medical program. This liability is being funded currently, and will pass through as a continuing obligation of the Reorganized Debtors under the Plan. The Reorganized Debtors will retain the ability to modify post-retirement benefits including those under the retiree medical program pursuant to the terms of the applicable post-retirement benefit plans.

2.9.3.4 Unfunded Special Pension Arrangements

As of June 30, 2008, the Debtors had approximately \$94.4 million of unfunded special pension arrangements. This amount represents the present value of various non-qualified, unfunded special pension arrangements with both current and former employees of the Debtors. Approximately \$15.8 million of this amount relates to due but unpaid amounts since the Petition Date under the Voluntary Supplemental Pension Payments and the Outside Directors' Retirement Plan as a result of funding limits set by the Bankruptcy Court in its order dated as of June 22, 2001 (Docket No. 559), and will be paid on the Effective Date or as soon as practicable thereafter. Pursuant to the Plan, the remainder will be re-instated as continuing obligations of the Reorganized Debtors and will be satisfied in accordance with their terms.

2.9.3.5 Accounts Payable

As of June 30, 2008, the Debtors had approximately \$31.2 million in liabilities to suppliers and other service providers that were due and payable as of the Petition Date (\$100,000 Administrative Expense Claims, \$200,000 Class 1, \$600,000 Class 2 and \$3.03 million Class 9). These liabilities will include post-petition interest compounded annually at either the non-default contractual rate underlying the Claim, if available, or the federal judgment rate of 4.19% as of April 2, 2001.²¹ As of June 30, 2008, this interest amounted to approximately \$10.9 million (\$40,000 related to Administrative Expense Claims, \$70,000 related to Class 1 Claims, \$200,000 related to Class 2 Claims and \$10.6 million related to Class 9 Claims).

2.9.3.6 Other Accrued Liabilities

As of June 30, 2008, the Debtors had approximately \$73.0 million in other accrued liabilities (excluding accounts payable and the accrued interest thereon). This amount represents contractual obligations and estimates of costs to resolve pre-petition contingencies. Of this amount, approximately \$46.3 million is expected to be classified as Class 9 Claims paid on the Effective Date (\$35.8 million of liabilities plus \$10.5 million of accrued interest). The remaining amounts will be reinstated and satisfied in accordance with their terms.

²¹ Pursuant to Plan Sections 3.1.9 (d) and (e), the Plan provides procedures whereby the Holders of Class 9 Claims, other than the Holders of the Lenders' Claims, may request a determination of whether they are entitled to post-petition interest at a rate or calculation other than the treatment provided for in the Plan. See Section 4.3.1.9 herein for a further discussion of these procedures.

2.10 Assets and Other Rights

2.10.1 Excess Real Property

The Debtors own a number of parcels of excess real property, most of which were used in previously divested operations, are not useful for the Debtors' current operations, and are not readily marketable. Some of the excess property is not marketable because it is undergoing environmental remediation, which is often an expensive and lengthy process. Although the Debtors are actively engaged in selling properties that are considered marketable, the net value of the Debtors' excess real property does not appear material.

2.10.2 Insurance Rights

2.10.2.1 Overview

Certain of the Debtors previously purchased liability insurance policies that provide coverage for the 1962 – 1985 period with respect to asbestos-related lawsuits and Claims. For the most part, coverage for years 1962 through 1972 has been exhausted, leaving coverage for years 1973 through 1985 available for pending and future asbestos claims. Since 1985, insurance coverage for asbestos-related liabilities has not been commercially available to the Debtors. Insurance policies that were purchased by the Debtors prior to 1962 previously were determined by the courts to be inapplicable because they were purchased prior to the year in which the Debtors acquired the Zonolite Company, through which the Debtors began producing asbestos-containing products. However, as part of the Zonolite acquisition, the Debtors obtained all rights under the insurance policies purchased by Zonolite.

2.10.2.2 Primary Insurance Coverage

The Debtors' primary insurance coverage for 1962-1985 is in the amount of \$1 million per occurrence with annual aggregate product-liability limits ranging from \$1 to \$2 million. In addition, as noted above, as part of the Zonolite acquisition, the Debtors obtained all rights under the insurance policies purchased by Zonolite. The coverage issued by Royal Indemnity Company ("Royal") to Zonolite for March 31, 1953 to April 1, 1963 was fully settled as to all asbestos-related claims in a January 5, 1995 Settlement Agreement in which Grace-Conn released Royal for claims "in any way relating to the New York Primary Action and/or payment or handling of Asbestos-Related Claims and other Product Claims under the Primary Policies" as provided in (and as those terms are defined) in the Settlement Agreement. With an exception described in the next sentence, coverage regarding the Grace and Zonolite primary policies for 1953-1985 has been fully settled and the settlement amounts paid in full. The only unsettled primary coverage is that of Continental Casualty Company ("Continental") for 1973-1985. In a pending declaratory judgment action in the Southern District of New York federal district court entitled *Continental Casualty Company v. W. R. Grace & Co., et al.*, 00 CIV 4524, the Debtors assert that this Continental coverage still is available to pay certain asbestos-related Claims, specifically, bodily injury claims that fall within the premises coverage of these policies. Although portions of the *Continental Casualty* action were settled in 2004, the settlement agreement did not resolve assertions of coverage for premises personal injury claims against Continental. The *Continental Casualty* action has been stayed; once the stay is lifted, the parties may reopen the case or take other action. *See* Section 2.8.3.7 *supra* for a detailed discussion.

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

Notwithstanding the assertions contained in the preceding paragraph, the Libby Claimants assert that there is premises insurance coverage available for their claims against the Debtors from Royal for the period 1953-1963. The Debtors and Royal disagree and contend that the coverage issued for this period has been fully settled as to all asbestos-related claims as outlined above. The Libby Claimants also assert that the Debtors' 1991 settlement with MCC may be able to be set aside and that premises coverage may be available under MCC's policies for the years 1962-1973. The Debtors and MCC disagree and contend that the coverage issued for this period has been fully settled as to all asbestos-related claims. The Libby Claimants assert that there is premises coverage available from Continental for the years 1973-1985. The Plan Proponents note that MCC and Continental dispute the contentions as to them. The Libby Claimants further assert that they, and not the Asbestos PI Trust, should be entitled to pursue the premises coverage available or potentially available under primary policies written for the Debtors or its predecessors by Royal, MCC, and Continental. The Plan Proponents disagree with these assertions, and note that any unsettled premises coverage available to pay Claims against the Debtors is in no way limited to Claims arising solely from exposures in Libby, Montana.

2.10.2.3 Excess Insurance Coverage

The Debtors' excess coverage is for levels of loss above certain levels. The levels vary from policy to policy, creating "layers" of excess coverage. As of June 30, 2008, after subtracting previous reimbursements by insurers and allowing for discounts pursuant to certain settlement agreements, there remains approximately \$917 million of excess products/completed operations coverage from more than 54 presently solvent insurers.

The Debtors have entered into settlement agreements with various excess insurance carriers. These settlements involve amounts paid and to be paid to the Debtors. One such settlement agreement provides for reimbursement of a specified percentage of each dollar spent by the Debtors or the Non-Debtor Affiliates to settle or defend asbestos-related Claims. It is the Debtors' position that, under this agreement, a group of carriers has agreed to reimburse the Debtors for 20% of each dollar spent to settle or defend personal injury or property damage Claims, up to a remaining maximum reimbursement of approximately \$78 million. The other settlement agreements generally require that personal injury Claims be spread over the Claimant's exposure period and that each insurer pay a pro rata portion of each Claim based on the amount of coverage provided during each year of the total exposure period. The remaining maximum aggregate amount available to pay Asbestos PI Claims under these other settlement agreements is approximately \$356 million of excess products/completed operations coverage. Nothing in Section 2.10.2.3 of this Disclosure Statement is intended to affect or vary the above-referenced settlement agreements.

In November 2006, the Debtors entered into a settlement and mutual release with an underwriter for \$90 million (the original face amount of such policies was \$136 million) of excess insurance coverage, which is included in the \$917 million referenced immediately

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

above.²² The insurer paid the settlement amount of \$90 million directly to an escrow account for the benefit of the Holders of Claims for which the Debtors were provided coverage under the affected policies. The escrow account balance at June 30, 2008 was approximately \$96.2 million, including interest earned on the account. Funds will be distributed from this account directly to the Asbestos PI Trust for the benefit of the Asbestos PI Claimants at the direction of the escrow agent pursuant to the terms of a confirmed plan of reorganization or as otherwise ordered by the Bankruptcy Court. The Debtors will record the amount in the escrow account as an asset and reduce their asbestos insurance receivable balance if and when all contingencies for the release of such amount are satisfied.

Presently, the Debtors have no settlement agreements in place with insurers with respect to approximately \$483 million of excess products/completed operations coverage. In addition, the Debtors have a face value of approximately \$253 million of excess products/completed operations coverage with insurance carriers that are insolvent or in receivership. The Debtors have filed and continue to file claims in the insolvency and receivership proceedings of carriers. The Debtors periodically receive distributions from some of these insolvent carriers and expect to receive distributions in the future. However, it is likely that the full face value will not be recovered.

2.10.2.4 Estimated Insurance Recoveries

As of June 30, 2008, including the settlement discussed above and after subtracting previous reimbursements by insurers and allowing for discounts pursuant to certain settlement agreements, there remains approximately \$917 million of excess products/completed operations coverage for Asbestos PI Claims from 54 presently solvent insurers of which the proceeds thereof will be transferred by the Debtors to the Asbestos PI Trust pursuant to the Plan. Certain of the coverage may also cover Asbestos PD Claims. However that coverage will not be available to the Reorganized Debtors or to the Asbestos PD Trust to pay Asbestos PD Claims because the Debtors are contributing all insurance proceeds directly to the Asbestos PI Trust. The prospective financial information does not take into account recoveries from insolvent carriers.

The amount of insurance recovered on such Claims will depend on a number of factors that will only be determined at the time claims are paid including: the relevant exposure years, the timing of payment and the solvency of insurers. The amount of insurance recovered on such Claims may also depend on the resolution of certain objections that have been raised, by certain insurers, with respect to the Plan's assignment of Asbestos Insurance Rights to the Asbestos PI Trust and related issues, as discussed more fully below in Section 9.4.

²² Pursuant to the settlement agreement, the underwriter has the right to terminate the settlement agreement, rendering it null and void, if, among other things, the Confirmation Order has not been entered by the Bankruptcy Court by December 31, 2008, or such later date to which the parties to the settlement agreement agree.

2.10.3 Debtors' Retained Causes of Action

2.10.3.1 Preservation of Causes of Action

The Debtors are currently investigating whether to pursue potential causes of action against any Claimants or Entities. The investigation has not been completed. Except as otherwise expressly contemplated by the Sealed Air Settlement Agreement, the Fresenius Settlement Agreement or other Plan Documents, and except for the Trust Causes of Action and Asbestos Insurance Rights, from and after the Effective Date, the Reorganized Debtors are retaining the Debtors' rights to commence and pursue any and all claims, causes of action, including the Retained Causes of Action, or defenses against any parties, including holders of Asbestos PD Claims, other Claimants and Holders of Equity Interests, whether such causes of action accrued before or after the Petition Date. The potential causes of action include the following:

- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, for, or in any way involving, the collection of accounts receivable or general ledger items that are due and owing to the Debtors, including trade receivables, rent and other lease and sublease charges, franchise and/or license fees, payments due under equipment leases and licenses, or other miscellaneous charges;
- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, against customers, for accounts receivable, improper setoff, overpayment, or any other claim arising out of the customer relationship;
- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, against vendors for overpayment, improper setoff, warranty, indemnity, or any other claim arising out of the vendor relationship;
- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, against Entities, including vendors with respect to pre-petition violations of applicable federal or state securities laws;
- All actual actions or potential breach of contract actions against any customers, vendors or Entities who violated the automatic stay after the Petition Date;
- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, against landlords, lessees, sublessees, or assignees arising from various leases, subleases and assignment agreements relating thereto, including actions for unpaid rent, overcharges relating to taxes, common area maintenance and other similar charges;
- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, against purchasers of assets from the Debtors relating to breach of the purchase agreement or unpaid compensation thereunder;
- Any and all rights to payment against any taxing authority or other potentially liable party, including parties other than the government for reimbursement of taxes and tax

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

payments, tax refunds, credits, overpayments or offsets that may be due and owing to the Debtors for taxes that the Debtors may have paid to any such taxing authority;

- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, relating to deposits or other amounts owed by any creditor, lessor utility, supplier, vendor, landlord, sub-lessee, assignee or other Entity;
- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, relating to environmental and product liability matters;
- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, arising out of, or relating to, the Debtors' intellectual property rights;
- Any litigation or lawsuit initiated by any of the Debtors that is currently pending, whether in the Bankruptcy Court, before the American Arbitration Association, or any other court or tribunal or initiated against the Debtors after the Petition Date for which the Debtors may have counterclaims or other rights;
- All actual actions or potential actions, whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, against any of the Debtors' former Professionals, except the Asbestos Protected Parties, for breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, negligence or professional misconduct or malpractice, or other tortious conduct;
- All actual or potential contract and tort actions that may exist or may subsequently arise; and
- All actual actions or potential actions whether legal, equitable or statutory in nature, arising out of, or in connection with the Debtors' business or operations, except actions against the Asbestos Protected Parties to the extent they are released by the Plan.

Attached as Exhibit 19 in the Exhibit Book is a nonexclusive list of the currently pending claims or causes of action brought or anticipated to be brought shortly by one or more of the Debtors. The above categories of Retained Causes of Action will not be limited in any way by the inclusion of exhibits in the Exhibit Book nor are the categories intended to be mutually exclusive.

In addition, it is possible that there are numerous unknown causes of action. The failure to list any such unknown causes of action above, or in Exhibit 19 in the Exhibit Book, is not intended to limit the rights of the Reorganized Debtors to pursue any of these actions to the extent the facts underlying such unknown causes of action become known to the Debtors.

2.10.3.2 Maintenance of Causes of Action

Except as otherwise provided in the Plan, the Reorganized Debtors are retaining all of the Debtors' rights to commence and pursue, as appropriate, in any court or other tribunal including, without limitation, in an adversary proceeding filed in one or more of the Chapter 11 Cases, any

and all causes of action, whether such causes of action accrued before or after the Petition Date, including those Retained Causes of Action listed in Exhibit 19 in the Exhibit Book.

Except as otherwise provided in the Plan, in accordance with Bankruptcy Code § 1123(b)(3), any Claims, rights, and causes of action, including the Retained Causes of Action, that the respective Debtors may hold against any Entity will vest in the Reorganized Debtors, and the Reorganized Debtors will retain and may exclusively enforce any and all such Claims, rights or causes of action, including Retained Causes of Action, and commence, pursue and settle the causes of action in accordance with the Plan. The Reorganized Debtors will have the exclusive right, authority, and discretion to institute, prosecute, abandon, settle, or compromise any and all such Claims, rights, and causes of action, including Retained Causes of Action, without the consent or approval of any third party and without any further order of the Court.

2.10.3.3 Avoidance Actions

The Debtors do not possess any causes of action for "Avoidance Actions" (actions or proceedings under Bankruptcy Code §§ 544, 545, 547, 548, or 553). Pursuant to Bankruptcy Code § 546(a), a debtor has two years after entry of the order for relief to bring Avoidance Actions. The Debtors' order for relief was entered on April 2, 2001; thus the deadline to bring Avoidance Actions was April 2, 2003. The Debtors analyzed potential Avoidance Actions and concluded that none should be commenced. The Debtors then provided their analysis to counsel for the Equity Committee and the various creditors' committees so that they could also determine whether there were any Avoidance Actions. Other than the Sealed Air Action and the Fresenius Action (which are respectively subject to the Sealed Air Settlement Agreement and the Fresenius Settlement Agreement, as described in Section 2.8.4 of this Disclosure Statement), no Avoidance Actions were brought by any party prior to the deadline. The Unsecured Creditors' Committee filed a motion seeking to extend the time within which the Avoidance Actions could be commenced but the Bankruptcy Court denied the motion.

2.10.3.4 Preservation of All Causes of Action not Expressly Settled or Released

Unless a Claim or Retained Cause of Action against a Claimant or other Entity is expressly waived, relinquished, released, compromised, settled, transferred or assigned in the Plan or any Final Order, the Debtors expressly reserve such Claim or Retained Cause of Action (including any unknown causes of action) for later adjudication by the Reorganized Debtors. Therefore, no preclusion doctrine, including the doctrines of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, issue preclusion, claim preclusion, waiver, estoppel (judicial, equitable, or other) or laches will apply to such Claims or Retained Causes of Action upon or after the Confirmation Date or Effective Date of the Plan based on this Disclosure Statement, the Plan or the Confirmation Order, except where such Claims or Retained Causes of Action have been expressly released in the Plan or other Final Order. In addition, the Debtors, the Reorganized Debtors, and their successors expressly reserve the right to pursue or adopt any Claim alleged in any lawsuit in which the Debtors are defendants or an interested party, against any Entity, including the plaintiffs or co-defendants in such lawsuits.

Any Entity that has incurred an obligation to the Debtors (whether on account of services, purchase or sale of goods or otherwise), or who has received services from the Debtors or a

transfer of money or property of the Debtors, or who has transacted business with the Debtors, or leased equipment or property from the Debtors should assume that such obligation, transfer, or transaction may be reviewed by the Debtors or the Reorganized Debtors, and may, if appropriate, be the subject of an action after the Effective Date, whether or not (1) such Entity has filed a proof of Claim against the Debtors in the Chapter 11 Cases, (2) such Claimant's proof of Claim has been objected to, (3) such Claimant's Claim was included in the Debtors' Schedules, or (4) such Claimant's scheduled Claim has been objected to by the Debtors or has been identified by the Debtors as a Disputed Claim, a Contingent Claim, or an Unliquidated Claim.

2.11 Estimated Value of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates

The Debtors have been advised by The Blackstone Group L.P. ("Blackstone") with respect to the reorganized enterprise value of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates (the "Reorganized Enterprise Value"). The Reorganized Enterprise Value is adjusted for estimates of the value of net debt, non-core liabilities, obligations under the Deferred Payment Agreement, and the Warrant issued to the Asbestos PI Trust to arrive at the equity value of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates (the "Reorganized Equity Value"). For purposes of this analysis, the Effective Date is assumed to be December 31, 2008.

2.11.1 Reorganized Enterprise Value of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates

Two valuation methodologies were used to determine the Reorganized Enterprise Value: (a) an analysis of public market values for selected similar public companies and (b) an analysis of transaction values for selected similar public merger and acquisition transactions. Based on these two methodologies, the estimated Reorganized Enterprise Value at the Effective Date is approximately \$3.20 billion to \$3.70 billion, with \$3.45 billion as the midpoint estimate.

2.11.1.1 Comparable Public Company Analysis

The comparable public company analysis ("Comparable Public Company Analysis") examines the market value of companies deemed similar to each of the businesses of the Reorganized Debtors and the Non-Debtor Affiliates: Grace Davison (excluding its Darex unit), Grace Construction Products, and Darex (each, a "Business" and, collectively, the "Businesses"). The Comparable Public Company Analysis determines the multiple of each comparable company's current enterprise value divided by (a) its EBITDA²³ for the last twelve months (as of its most recently available financial statements) and (b) its calendar year 2008 estimated EBITDA, which is based on consensus projections by equity research analysts of third-party financial institutions as compiled by Capital IQ / Reuters. The resulting ranges of multiples for each Business' comparable companies are then applied to the latest twelve months and projected 2008 EBITDA of each of the Businesses to estimate the Reorganized Enterprise Value of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates.

²³ EBITDA is defined as operating income (excluding the impact of non-recurring items) before interest and financing expenses, taxes, and depreciation and amortization. EBITDA is a supplemental measure that is not required by or presented in accordance with US GAAP. The EBITDA for Darex was developed solely for the purpose of estimating the Reorganized Enterprise Value.

A key factor to this approach is the selection of companies with relatively similar business and operational characteristics to the Businesses of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates. Criteria for selecting comparable companies include, among other relevant characteristics, similar lines of business, target market segments, market presence, size, scale of operations, and business risks. The selection of comparable companies is often difficult and subject to interpretation.

2.11.1.2 The Precedent Transaction Analysis

The precedent transaction analysis ("Precedent Transaction Analysis") estimates value by examining a comparable company's disclosed transaction value as a multiple of its key operating statistics. Transactions were identified in each of the three primary sectors in which the Businesses compete, and multiples for these transactions were calculated by dividing the purchase price paid (including the assumption of debt) by the target company's EBITDA for the last twelve months of available financial information prior to the transaction. A range of these multiples was then applied to the EBITDA for the last twelve months of each of the Businesses to estimate Reorganized Enterprise Value.

Due to the fact that the results of a Precedent Transaction Analysis often reflect a control premium, or are impacted by a competitive dynamic due to multiple bidders, the valuation multiples in a Precedent Transaction Analysis indicate aspects of value that may not necessarily be indicative of a company's inherent asset or operating value. Moreover, it should be noted that valuation conclusions cannot be based solely upon quantitative results. The reasons for, and circumstances surrounding, each acquisition transaction are specific to such acquisition, and there are inherent differences between the businesses, operations and prospects of each. Qualitative judgments must be made concerning the differences among the characteristics of these transactions and other factors and issues, which could affect the target company's value.

2.11.2 Calculation of Reorganized Equity Value

The Reorganized Enterprise Value is adjusted by the following items to determine the Reorganized Equity Value of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates: (a) net debt, (b) minority interest, (c) non-core liabilities, (d) the present value of obligations under the Deferred Payment Agreement and (e) the Black-Scholes value of the warrants issued to the Asbestos PI Trust.

2.11.2.1 Net Debt

The estimated net debt, as of the assumed Effective Date of December 31, 2008, consists of \$1.5 billion of funded debt and \$381 million of Cash upon emergence from bankruptcy. Net debt could ultimately be higher or lower than this estimate, depending on the resolution of Claims, actual cash funding requirements of the Plan and free cash flow generation before emergence.

2.11.2.2 Minority Interest

The value of certain joint ventures of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates to unaffiliated third parties is recognized as minority interest and deducted from Reorganized

Enterprise Value in calculating Reorganized Equity Value. As set forth in the Financial Information, the projected value of this account, which primarily pertains to Chevron Products Company's interest in Advanced Refining Technologies LLC, is estimated to be approximately \$62 million as of December 31, 2008.

2.11.2.3 Non-Core Liabilities

Non-core liabilities that pass through bankruptcy and are paid in future years are deducted from the Reorganized Enterprise Value in determining Reorganized Equity Value. The projected book value of non-core liabilities, estimated as of December 31, 2008, is approximately \$328 million. The actual value of these non-core liabilities could be higher or lower, depending on, among other things, the resolution of Claims, the timing of certain payments, and the level of contingency payments.

2.11.2.4 Deferred Payment Agreement

The present value of the obligations under the Deferred Payment Agreement is deducted from the Reorganized Enterprise Value as part of the calculation of Reorganized Equity Value. The five annual payments of \$110 million commencing on January 2, 2019 and ten annual payments of \$100 million commencing on January 2, 2024 have been discounted back to December 31, 2008 at an assumed discount rate of 10%. This discount rate reflects the subordinated nature of the deferred asbestos payments and results in a \$338 million liability on a present value basis at December 31, 2008.

2.11.2.5 Warrant Issued to Trust

Under the Plan, a Warrant will be issued to the Asbestos PI Trust, with a one-year term, to acquire 10 million shares of Parent Common Stock at an exercise price of \$17.00 per share. The Warrant has an estimated value, based on the Black-Scholes option pricing methodology, ranging from approximately \$29 million to \$74 million. This value has been deducted from the Reorganized Enterprise Value in arriving at the Reorganized Equity Value of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates.

2.11.2.6 Summary

Based on the above assumptions, the estimated Reorganized Equity Value of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates ranges from approximately \$1.3 billion to \$1.8 billion. Given that equity interests of the Debtors will pass through bankruptcy under the Plan, the Reorganized Debtors will have approximately 72.2 million shares after emerging from bankruptcy. As a result, the Reorganized Equity Value on a share basis ranges from \$18.28 per share to \$24.59 per share (the "Reorganized Share Price") before accounting for the effects of the Warrant and the management incentive plan.

The estimates of Reorganized Enterprise Value, Reorganized Equity Value, and Reorganized Share Price do not purport to be appraisals, liquidation values, or estimates of the actual market value that may be realized if assets are sold. The estimates of Reorganized Enterprise Value, Reorganized Equity Value and Reorganized Share Price represent hypothetical

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

values developed solely for purposes of the Plan and should not be relied upon in making investment decisions to purchase or sell Parent Common Stock at any time, now or in the future.

The estimates of Reorganized Enterprise Value, Reorganized Equity Value, and Reorganized Share Price are highly dependent upon achieving the future financial results set forth in the pro forma and prospective Financial Information as well as the realization of certain other assumptions which are not guaranteed, including assumptions regarding the value of unliquidated Claims and estimates presented herein regarding tax and cash assets as well as net debt and other liabilities. Because such estimates are inherently subject to uncertainties, neither the Debtors, the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates, Blackstone, nor any other person assumes responsibility for their accuracy.

The Parent Common Stock of Grace is traded on the New York Stock Exchange (TICKER: GRA). The estimates of the range of Reorganized Share Price do not purport to be estimates of the pre- or post-reorganization trading value of the Parent Common Stock and the estimates of the Reorganized Share Price may not correlate with actual trading prices on the New York Stock Exchange. The estimated values set forth herein do not necessarily reflect values that could be attainable in public or private markets and do not consider market conditions, market trading characteristics, restrictions on stock acquisitions currently in effect by order of the Bankruptcy Court (which will terminate on the Effective Date), or perceptions in public or private markets about the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates or the value of the Parent Common Stock. The trading value of the Parent Common Stock may be materially different from the estimates set forth in this Estimated Value of the Reorganized Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates.

3. THE CHAPTER 11 FILINGS AND RELATED CANADIAN PROCEEDINGS

3.1 Overview of Chapter 11

Chapter 11 is the principal business reorganization chapter of the Bankruptcy Code. Chapter 11 authorizes a debtor to reorganize its business for its benefit and its stakeholders' benefit, whether those stakeholders are its creditors or equity interest holders. In addition to permitting a debtor to rehabilitate itself, chapter 11 also requires that any distributions to stakeholders ensure equality of treatment for similarly situated creditors and similarly situated equity interest holders.

Commencing a chapter 11 case creates an estate that comprises all of the legal and equitable interests of the debtor as of the filing date. The Bankruptcy Code provides that the debtor may continue to operate its business and remain in possession of its property as a "debtor in possession."

The principal objective of a chapter 11 case is to consummate a plan of reorganization. A plan of reorganization sets forth the means for satisfying claims against and equity interests in a debtor. Confirmation of a plan of reorganization by a bankruptcy court binds a debtor, any issuer of securities thereunder, any person acquiring property under the plan, and any creditor or equity interest holder of that debtor to the terms of the plan. Subject to certain limited exceptions, the confirmation order discharges a debtor from any debt that arose prior to the date of confirmation of the plan, and substitutes therefore the obligations specified in the confirmed plan.

3.2 Significant Events During the Course of the Chapter 11 Cases

Many pleadings have been filed with the Bankruptcy Court and District Court during the course of the Chapter 11 Cases, and many hearings have been conducted in connection with those pleadings. In order to obtain a comprehensive listing of the pleadings and events that have been filed in the Chapter 11 Cases, the docket for each case should be consulted. The relevant pleadings referenced below may be obtained and reviewed from the Bankruptcy Court or District Court, as applicable. The following is a general description of the more significant pleadings that have been filed during the Chapter 11 Cases which have not been previously discussed in Article 2 above. All docket numbers refer to Case No. 01-1139 unless otherwise stated.

3.2.1 First Day Motions and Further Developments in the Chapter 11 Cases

3.2.1.1 Retention and Employment of Professionals by the Debtors

The Bankruptcy Court approved the Debtors' request to retain certain professionals to represent them and assist them in connection with the Chapter 11 Cases on May 3, 2001. These professionals include: (a) Kirkland & Ellis LLP and Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl, Young, Jones & Weintraub, P.C. (now known as Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP) as bankruptcy counsel (Docket Nos. 180 and 181, respectively); (b) Blackstone as Financial Advisors (Docket No. 182); (c) Kekst & Company Incorporated as public relations consultant (Docket No. 183); (d) R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company as the notice agent (Docket No. 15); and (e) Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz as special corporate counsel (Docket No. 184). The Debtors were also authorized to retain and employ and compensate certain Professionals utilized in the ordinary course of the Debtors' businesses (Docket No. 197).

In addition to the first day retention motions, the Debtors have also employed several other professionals during the course of these Chapter 11 Cases, the most significant of which are (a) Rust Consulting, Inc. as official claims agent (Docket No. 1097); (b) BMC Group, Inc. (f/k/a Bankruptcy Management Corporation) as claims reconciliation and solicitation consultant (Docket No. 2021); (c) Reed Smith LLP as special asbestos product liability defense counsel (Docket No. 707); and (d) Deloitte and Touche LLP, and certain related affiliates which have been employed to serve as customs services providers, tax service providers, compensation advisors, and providers of certain due diligence services, certain enterprise risk management services, and crisis management planning services (Docket Nos. 3932, 6462, 7253, 17427, 17882).

3.2.1.2 Financing and Critical Trade Motions

The Debtors filed their "Emergency Motion for Interim and Final Orders under 11 U.S.C. §§ 105, 362, 363 and 364 Approving Post-Petition Financing and Related Relief and Setting Final Hearing Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 4001(c)" (the "Financing Motion") (Docket No. 26) on the Petition Date whereby the Debtors sought authority to enter into a post-petition credit agreement. The Bankruptcy Court granted the emergency relief and subsequently, on May 3, 2001, granted final relief in connection with the Financing Motion (Docket No. 194). Pursuant to the loan agreements, the Debtors had available up to \$250 million. The Debtors previously requested and were granted five extensions on their post-petition financing. On March 17, 2008, the Bankruptcy Court extended the Debtors' post-petition credit facility in the amount of \$165

million, with the right to receive additional financing for an additional amount up to \$85 million if under acceptable financial terms, until the earlier of (a) April 1, 2010 or (b) the Debtors' emergence from bankruptcy (Docket No. 18315).

As part of the first day motions, the Debtors also were granted authority to pay in the ordinary course of business the pre-petition claims of essential trade creditors up to the sum of \$4.5 million (Docket No. 195).

3.2.1.3 Operational Motions

As part of the first day motions, the Debtors were granted authority to (a) pay certain pre-petition obligations, including certain sales, use and franchise taxes, as well as charges relating to shipping and most employee benefits and (b) maintain their existing bank accounts, business forms, cash management systems, and intercompany agreements (Docket Nos. 18 and 21 respectively). Additionally, the Debtors sought, and the Bankruptcy Court granted, authority to honor certain pre-petition obligations to customers and otherwise continue in the ordinary course of business certain customer programs and practices (Docket No. 19).

3.2.2 Motions to Assume Pre-petition Executory Contracts and Leases

On April 3, 2001, the Debtors moved the Bankruptcy Court for authority to assume the existing employment contracts with the following key employees: (a) Paul J. Norris (Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer), (b) David B. Siegel (Senior Vice President and General Counsel), (c) Robert M. Tarola (Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer), (d) William M. Corcoran (Vice President, Public and Regulatory Affairs), (e) Wayne T. Smith (Vice President and General Manager of Grace Performance Chemicals), (f) Ann E. MacDonald (Sales and Marketing Manager), and (g) Johnny P. Forehand, Jr. (Vice President, Operations). The Bankruptcy Court granted the Debtors' motion on June 22, 2001 (Docket No. 560).²⁴

The Debtors have also periodically sought and received authority from the Bankruptcy Court to assume and/or assign certain leases.

3.2.3 Appointment of Official Committees of Creditors, the Official Equity Committee and the Future Claims Representative

3.2.3.1 Official Committees of Creditors

3.2.3.1.1 Unsecured Creditors' Committee

The Unsecured Creditors' Committee was formed on April 13, 2001 when the United States Trustee issued and filed an amended notice of its appointment (Docket No. 94). Subsequently, the Unsecured Creditors' Committee received Bankruptcy Court approval to

²⁴ On April 24, 2005, the Bankruptcy Court approved the Debtors' entry into a post-retirement consulting agreement with Paul J. Norris who retired as the Debtors' CEO and also approved a Revised CEO Agreement with Alfred E. Festa who replaced Mr. Norris (Docket No. 8340). Additionally, on June 27, 2005, the Bankruptcy Court approved the Debtors' entry into a post-retirement consulting agreement with David Siegel, the Debtors' former general counsel and Chief Restructuring Officer (Docket No. 8716).

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

employ (a) Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP, as counsel (Docket No. 340); (b) Duane, Morris & Heckscher LLP n/k/a Duane Morris LLP, as local counsel (Docket No. 550); (c) FTI Pollicano Manzo, as financial advisors (Docket No. 549); and (d) Capstone Corporate Recovery, LLC to replace FTI Pollicano Manzo as financial advisors except with respect to tax related services (Docket No. 5758). Thereafter, Navigant Consulting, Inc. f/k/a Chambers Associates was employed as the asbestos issues expert for the Unsecured Creditors' Committee.

As originally appointed, the Unsecured Creditors' Committee was comprised of nine members: (i) J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.; (ii) Wachovia Bank NA; (iii) Bank of America, N.A.; (iv) First Union National Bank; (v) ABN Amro Bank N.V.; (vi) The Bank of New York, as indenture trustee; (vii) Bankers Trust Co, as indenture trustee; (viii) Sealed Air Corporation; and (ix) Zhagrus Environmental Inc. During the course of the chapter 11 cases, certain members of the Unsecured Creditors' Committee resigned, one new member was appointed and subsequently resigned and certain members merged. The Committee currently has three members: (i) J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.; (ii) Wachovia Bank, NA; and (iii) Sealed Air Corporation.

3.2.3.1.2 Asbestos PI Committee

The Asbestos PI Committee was formed on April 13, 2001 when the United States Trustee issued and filed a notice of its appointment (Docket No. 95). Subsequently, the Asbestos PI Committee sought and received Bankruptcy Court approval to employ (a) Legal Analysis Systems, Inc., as consultants (Docket No. 206); (b) Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered, as counsel (Docket No. 208); (c) L. Tersigni Consulting, P.C., as financial advisors (Docket No. 209); (d) Ashby & Geddes, P.A., as local counsel for the period from April 12, 2001 through June 15, 2001 (Docket No. 697); and (e) Campbell & Levine, LLC, as local counsel beginning June 16, 2001 (Docket No. 698).

The Asbestos PI Committee has sought and received Bankruptcy Court approval to employ additional professionals including: (a) Anderson Kill & Olick, P.C. as special insurance counsel (Docket No. 8612) and (b) Charter Oak Financial Consultants, LLC, as Financial Advisor to replace L. Tersigni Consulting (Docket No. 16517).

3.2.3.1.3 Asbestos PD Committee

The Asbestos PD Committee was formed on May 11, 2001 when the United States Trustee issued and filed an amended notice of its appointment (Docket No. 252). Subsequently, the Asbestos PD Committee sought and received Bankruptcy Court approval to employ: (a) Bilzin Sumberg Dunn Baena Price & Axelrod LLP (now known as Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP), as counsel (Docket No. 551); (b) Ferry & Joseph, P.A., as local counsel (Docket No. 553); (c) Conway, Del Genio, Gries & Co., as financial advisor and investment banker (Docket No. 1027); (d) Hamilton, Rabinovitz & Aschuler, Inc. (Docket No. 1735) and W.D. Hilton, Jr. (Docket No. 1736), as consultants; and (e) LECG, LLC as consultants (Docket No. 8416).

3.2.3.2 Official Equity Committee

The Equity Committee was formed on June 18, 2001 when the United States Trustee issued and filed a notice of its appointment (Docket No. 532). The Equity Committee sought and

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

received Bankruptcy Court approval to employ: (a) Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP, as counsel (Docket No. 985); (b) Klett Rooney Lieber & Schorling, P.C. (now known as Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC), as co-counsel (Docket Nos. 1275 and 13288); and (c) Lexecon LLC as asbestos claims consultant (Docket No. 16653).

3.2.3.3 Representative for Future Asbestos Claimants

On May 24, 2004, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order appointing David T. Austern as the legal representative for the future asbestos personal injury claimants (the Asbestos PI FCR) (Docket No. 5645). The Asbestos PI FCR sought and received Bankruptcy Court approval to employ: (a) CIBC World Markets Corp. (“CIBC”) as financial advisor (Docket No. 6479), and (b) Swidler Berlin LLP (“Swidler”) as bankruptcy counsel (Docket No. 6480). Thereafter, the attorneys at Swidler responsible for representing the Asbestos PI FCR joined Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP (“Orrick”) in 2006 and the Asbestos PI FCR sought and received leave from the Bankruptcy Court to employ Orrick (Docket No. 12379). The financial advisors employed by CIBC to work with the Asbestos PI FCR joined Piper Jaffray & Co. (“PJC”) in 2006 and the Asbestos PI FCR sought and received Bankruptcy Court approval to employ PJC (Docket No. 11919). Joseph Radecki, Jr., the primary advisor to the Asbestos PI FCR, subsequently left PJC and formed Tre Angeli LLC (“Tre Angeli”). The Asbestos PI FCR then sought Bankruptcy Court approval to employ Tre Angeli to work with PJC and sought approval to modify the PJC retention agreement to reflect this new arrangement. This new retention arrangement was approved by the Bankruptcy Court on July 29, 2008 (Docket No. 19189).

3.2.4 Section 341(a) Meeting of Creditors

On May 18, 2001, the United States Trustee’s office conducted the meeting of creditors required by Bankruptcy Code § 341(a). Representatives of the Debtors, as well as the Debtors’ counsel, appeared at the section 341(a) meeting and responded to inquiries from the United States Trustee and creditors.

3.2.5 Selected Adversary Proceedings

3.2.5.1 Stay of Asbestos-Related Litigation Against Various Affiliates

Contemporaneously with the filings of their chapter 11 petitions, the Debtors filed the adversary proceeding entitled *W. R. Grace & Co., et al. v. Margaret Chakarian, et al. and John Does 1-1000* (Adv. Pro. No. 01-771). A temporary restraining order restraining certain actions against non-debtor third parties was initially entered on April 2, 2001 and on May 3, 2001, the Bankruptcy Court issued a preliminary injunction. On January 22, 2002, the Bankruptcy Court entered an “Order Granting Modified Preliminary Injunction” (Adv. Pro. No. 01-771, Docket No. 87) which, among other things, enjoined the commencement or continuation of certain actions against non-debtor third-parties, including actions: (a) that arise from alleged exposure to asbestos, indirectly or directly, allegedly caused by the Debtors, against (1) Fresenius, (2) Sealed Air, (3) Merrill Lynch, (4) Credit Suisse First Boston Corporation, (5) Robinson Insulation, Co., (6) certain of the Debtors’ insurance carriers, including Maryland Casualty Company, Continental Casualty Company and their affiliates, (7) Affiliates of the Debtors that are not filing entities for purposes of the Chapter 11 Cases, and (8) present and former officers,

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

directors and employees of the Debtors; (b) for which there may be coverage under certain of the Debtors' insurance policies; (c) brought against certain of the Debtors' insurance carriers, which allege coverage for asbestos-related liabilities; and (d) against current and former officers, directors or employees of the Debtors that arise out of such officers', directors' and employees' employment or relationship with the Debtors (the "Preliminary Injunction").

On February 4, 2002, certain claimants who have identified themselves as claimants injured by exposure to asbestos from the Debtors' operations in Lincoln County, Montana (the "Libby Claimants"), filed a motion to clarify the scope of the Preliminary Injunction or to modify the Preliminary Injunction (Adv. Pro. No. 01-771, Docket No. 86). Specifically, the Libby Claimants sought entry of an order stating that, to the extent their asserted causes of action against Maryland Casualty Company ("MCC"), one of the Debtors' insurers, were based upon MCC's own, independent tortious conduct, the Preliminary Injunction did not stay such litigation. On June 20, 2002, the Bankruptcy Court denied the motion for clarification (Adv. Pro. No. 01-771, Docket No. 109). The Libby Claimants appealed the Bankruptcy Court's June 20, 2002 order and also appealed the Bankruptcy Court's September 12, 2002 order denying the Libby Claimants' motion to reconsider the June 20, 2002 order. On July 16, 2003, the District Court vacated the Bankruptcy Court's June 20, 2002 order and remanded the matter to the Bankruptcy Court for further proceedings (Delaware District Court Case No. 02-1549). MCC appealed the District Court's decision, and, on October 28, 2004, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals vacated the District Court's order and affirmed the Bankruptcy Court's decision that the Preliminary Injunction stayed the litigation with respect to MCC (Third Circuit Case No. 03-3453). As a result, the Libby Claimants' lawsuits against MCC are presently stayed pursuant to the Preliminary Injunction. On October 7, 2004, the Bankruptcy Court expanded the scope of the Preliminary Injunction to also enjoin actions being brought by the Libby Claimants against Montana Vermiculite Company.

In addition, the following actions were also enjoined by the Preliminary Injunction: (a) *TIG Ins. Co. v. Smolker*, (Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC 173952), and all related appeals, (b) *Ellison v. FPC Disposal, Inc.* (Okla. Dist. Ct., Canadian County, Case No. CJ-99-151-01) as to Samson Investment Company, Samson Hydrocarbons Co., and its subsidiaries and affiliates, (c) *Exxon Corp. v. Samson Hydrocarbons* (District Court of Creek County Case No. CJ-99-390), and (d) *Youpee v. Samson Hydrocarbons Co.* (District Court of Montana Case No. CV-98-108-BLD-JDS), which has been conditionally settled in the Montana federal district court.

One limited exception to the Preliminary Injunction relates to the action entitled *Robert Locke v. W. R. Grace and Robert Bettacchi* (Mass. Sup. Ct., Middlesex County, Case No. 99-2530) (the "Locke Action"). Pursuant to a stipulation, the parties to the Locke Action were allowed to complete discovery, prosecute and defend a summary judgment motion, and take such actions as are necessary or appropriate to exercise their rights of appeal, if any, with respect to the summary judgment motion, until such rights have been exhausted. Subsequently, the state court granted summary judgment in the Debtors' favor on some, but not all of the counts of the complaint in the Locke Action. The remainder of the Locke Action is stayed pursuant to the automatic stay and the Preliminary Injunction.

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

On June 9, 2005, the State of Montana (“Montana”) filed a motion for relief from the automatic stay in the Chapter 11 Cases. In its motion, Montana sought leave to join the Debtors as third-party defendants in approximately 120 cases brought by the Libby Claimants against Montana in its various state courts (the “State Court Actions”). Montana alleges that it was named as a defendant in the State Court Actions for claims arising from the Debtors’ mining and processing of asbestos-containing vermiculite within the state. Montana alleges that it is necessary to join the Debtors in the State Court Actions because, to the extent that liability is imposed on Montana as a result of the State Court Actions, such liability could only be remote and derivative from, or concurrent with, the acts and liabilities of the Debtors. Montana asserts that it will seek indemnification from the Debtors to the extent judgments are entered against it in the State Court Actions for any sums that may be adjudged by the Libby Claimants against it and, to the extent Montana is found liable for damages, it will seek contribution from the Debtors and apportionment of liability on the basis of their comparative fault.

The Debtors and each of the official committees in the Chapter 11 Cases filed an opposition to Montana’s motion for relief from stay. In addition, on August 22, 2005, the Debtors filed a motion in their Chapter 11 Cases to expand their Preliminary Injunction to include the State Court Actions. The Debtors also filed a motion seeking leave to amend its Adversary Complaint (Adv. Pro. No. 01-771) to include Montana in the definition of Affiliated Entities protected by the Preliminary Injunction and to expand the defendants named in the Adversary Complaint to include the Libby Claimants who were plaintiffs in the State Court Actions. On April 16, 2007, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order denying the Debtors’ request to expand the Preliminary Injunction to enjoin actions being brought against Montana. On April 26, 2007, the Debtors and Montana filed motions to alter and amend or reconsider this order, arguing that it was contrary to the precedent from the Third Circuit discussed above. On March 31, 2008, the Bankruptcy Court denied the motions to reconsider its April 16, 2007 denial of the expansion of the Preliminary Injunction to enjoin actions being brought against Montana. The Debtors sought leave to appeal the decision to the District Court (District Court of Delaware Case No. 08-246). On March 27, 2008, the District Court entered an order permitting leave to appeal and affirming the Bankruptcy Court’s denial of the expansion of the preliminary injunction (Docket No. 484). The Debtors and Montana thereafter filed Notices of Appeal with the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Montana also filed a Motion with the District Court, in which the Debtors joined, requesting a stay pending appeal. On October 28, 2008, the District Court denied the request for a stay pending appeal. The Third Circuit has not yet set a briefing schedule on the appeal.

The Debtors were also notified by Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (“BNSF”), MCC, Royal Insurance Company (“Royal”) and Continental Casualty Company (“Continental”) that hundreds of Libby Claimants were pursuing numerous complaints against BNSF with respect to alleged asbestos-related injuries they sustained while working for BNSF or as a result of their residing in and around the Libby, Montana area. BNSF notified the Debtors that they believe that the Debtors are liable to BNSF for both common law and contractual indemnities arising from these lawsuits on the grounds that they relate to exposure to the Debtors’ vermiculite and vermiculite-containing products that may have been transported by BNSF or placed on BNSF property by the Debtors. The Debtors’ insurance carriers notified the Debtors that they believe the Debtors are liable to them under contractual indemnities for any claims that the plaintiffs or BNSF may assert against them relating to these lawsuits. On February 15, 2007,

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

BNSF filed a motion for clarification of the scope of the Preliminary Injunction. As a result, on March 26, 2007 the Debtors filed a motion to expand the Preliminary Injunction to enjoin the Libby Claimants from proceeding with their suits against BNSF. The Debtors also filed a motion seeking leave to amend their Adversary Complaint (Adv. Pro. No. 01-771) to include BNSF in the definition of Affiliated Entities protected by the Preliminary Injunction and to expand the defendants named in the Complaint to include additional Libby Claimants. The Bankruptcy Court entered a temporary stay as to the State Court Actions against BNSF and on April 14, 2008 entered an order expanding the scope of the Preliminary Injunction to also enjoin actions being brought against BNSF. The Preliminary Injunction has no expiration date. On April 24, 2008, the Libby Plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal to the District Court and motion for leave to appeal. The motion for leave is fully briefed and remains pending. The appeal has not been briefed.

3.2.5.2 Indirect PI Trust Claims

Pursuant to the Plan, certain Claims defined as Indirect PI Trust Claims are included in the definition of Asbestos PI Claims and consequently receive the same treatment as Asbestos PI Claims, including being discharged with respect to the Debtors, channeled to the Asbestos PI Trust and subject to the Asbestos PI Channeling Injunction (which, among other things, enjoins the assertion of Asbestos PI Claims, including Indirect PI Trust Claims, against any of the Asbestos Protected Parties including without limitation the Settled Asbestos Insurance Companies) effective as of the Effective Date. Indirect PI Trust Claims include claims for (a) reimbursement, indemnification, subrogation or contribution on account of damages a Claimant has paid or may pay to plaintiffs in cases against such Claimant on account of claims that would constitute Asbestos PI Claims against the Debtors; and (b) Claims asserted against the Debtors by Claimants seeking reimbursement, indemnification, subrogation, or contribution from the Debtors with respect to any insurance settlement agreement, surety bond, letter of credit or other financial assurance issued by, or entered into, any Entity on account of or with respect to an Asbestos PI Claim. Claims in the first category include claims asserted against the Debtors by Claimants such as MCC, Montana, Continental and other similarly situated parties as well as any claims that may be asserted against the Debtors or the Reorganized Debtors by BNSF and The Scotts Company LLC ("Scotts") (as discussed below) for reimbursement, indemnification, subrogation or contribution on account of damages such Claimants have paid or may pay to the plaintiffs such as the Libby Claimants (discussed above), for death, bodily injury, sickness, disease, or other personal injuries to the extent caused or allegedly caused by exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products for which the Debtors have liability. Claims in the second category include Claims asserted against the Debtors by (a) Royal, Continental, MCC and other Settled Asbestos Insurance Companies arising out of insurance settlement agreements, (b) Tempo Master Fund L.P. and Morgan Stanley Senior Funding, as successor to the Bank of America, N.A. (collectively "Tempo"), relating to letters of credit which have been drawn to reimburse National Union Fire Insurance Company and its affiliates ("National Union") for payments made on an Asbestos PI Settlement and (b) the contingent claims of Fireman's Fund and Wachovia Bank, NA related to the *Edwards* judgment currently stayed on appeal (see footnote 15 herein).

Pursuant to Section 5.6 of the Trust Distribution Procedures, Indirect PI Trust Claims shall be treated as presumptively valid and paid by the Asbestos PI Trust, subject to the

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

applicable Payment Percentage, if the following conditions are met: (a) the claim has not been disallowed; and (b) the holder of such Claim (the "Indirect Claimant") establishes that (i) the Indirect Claimant has paid in full the liability and obligation of the Asbestos PI Trust to the individual claimant to whom the Asbestos PI Trust would otherwise have had a liability or obligation under the TDP (the "Direct Claimant"), (ii) the Direct Claimant and the Indirect Claimant have forever and fully released the Asbestos PI Trust from all liability to the Direct Claimant, and (iii) the claim is not otherwise barred by a statute of limitation or repose or by other applicable law.

To establish a presumptively valid Indirect PI Trust Claim, the Indirect Claimant's aggregate liability for the Direct Claimant's claim must have been fixed, liquidated and paid fully by the Indirect Claimant by settlement (with an appropriate full release in favor of the Asbestos PI Trust) or a Final Order provided that such claim is valid under the applicable state law.

If an Indirect Claimant cannot meet the presumptive requirements set forth above, including the requirement that the Indirect Claimant provide the Asbestos PI Trust with a full release of the Direct Claimant's claim, the Indirect Claimant may request that the Asbestos PI Trust review the Indirect PI Trust Claim individually to determine whether the Indirect Claimant can establish that the Indirect Claimant has paid all or a portion of a liability or obligation of the Asbestos PI Trust respecting an Asbestos PI Claim. If the Indirect Claimant can show that it has paid all or a portion of such a liability or obligation (or its claim has previously been allowed), the Asbestos PI Trust shall reimburse the Indirect Claimant the amount of the liability or obligation so paid, times the then applicable Payment Percentage. However, in no event shall such reimbursement to the Indirect Claimant be greater than the amount to which the underlying Asbestos PI Claimant would have otherwise been entitled. Further, the liquidated value of any Indirect PI Trust Claim paid by the Asbestos PI Trust to an Indirect Claimant shall be treated as an offset to or reduction of the full liquidated value of any underlying Asbestos PI Trust Claim that might be asserted against the Asbestos PI Trust.

Any dispute between the Asbestos PI Trust and an Indirect Claimant over whether the Indirect Claimant has a right to reimbursement for any amount paid to a Direct Claimant shall be subject to the ADR Procedures provided in Section 5.10 of the Trust Distribution Procedures. If such dispute is not resolved by said ADR Procedures, the Indirect Claimant may litigate the dispute in the tort system pursuant to Sections 5.11 and 7.6 of the Trust Distribution Procedures.

The Asbestos PI Trust Trustees may develop and approve a separate proof of claim form for Indirect PI Trust Claims. Indirect PI Trust Claims that have not been disallowed, discharged, or otherwise resolved by prior order of the Bankruptcy Court shall be processed in accordance with procedures to be developed and implemented by the Trustees consistent with the provisions of Section 5.6 of the Trust Distribution Procedures, which procedures (a) shall determine the validity, and enforceability of such claims; and (b) shall otherwise provide the same liquidation and payment procedures and rights to the Holders of such claims as the Asbestos PI Trust would have afforded the Holders of the underlying valid Asbestos PI Trust Claims.

Indirect PI Trust Claims that are Pre-Petition Liquidated Claims (as defined in the Trust Distribution Procedures) are not subject to the above-referenced conditions of Section 5.6 of the

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

Trust Distribution Procedures and will receive the same treatment as other Pre-Petition Liquidated Claims as outlined in Section 5.2 of the Trust Distribution Procedures.

On the Effective Date, all Claims against the Debtors shall be discharged and all Asbestos PI Claims, including Indirect PI Trust Claims, will be channeled to the Asbestos PI Trust. The Preliminary Injunction outlined above will be dissolved but it shall be replaced by a permanent injunction under sections 524(a) and 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code against the commencement or continuation of an action, the employment of process or an act to collect, recover or offset any such debt as a personal liability of the Debtors (*see* Section 8.1.1 of the Plan). Likewise, pursuant to the Asbestos PI Channeling Injunction, the sole recourse of the Holder of an Asbestos PI Claim shall be to the Asbestos PI Trust and such Holder shall have no right whatsoever to assert its Asbestos PI Claim against the Debtors, Reorganized Debtors or any other Asbestos Protected Party or any property interest of the Debtors, the Reorganized Debtors or any other Asbestos Protected Party (*see* Section 8.2.1 of the Plan). Thus, the Libby Claimants will be prohibited from pursuing their Asbestos PI Claims against the Debtors, the Reorganized Debtors and the Asbestos Protected Parties. The Plan will not prohibit the Libby Claimants from proceeding with their State Court Actions against third parties who are not Asbestos Protected Parties such as Montana and BNSF. However, any claims that those third parties may have against the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors arising out of the State Court Actions, other than any claims involving or relating to the independent liability of those third parties, will constitute Indirect PI Trust Claims as outlined above.

Certain potential Holders of Indirect PI Trust Claims such as Montana, BNSF, Scotts and Tempo have asserted that they believe their Claims against the Debtors for contribution and indemnification are not properly classified as Indirect PI Trust Claims and such Claims should be treated as Class 9 General Unsecured Claims or, in the case of Scotts, Montana and BNSF, as either post-petition or post-confirmation claims. Royal contends that its claims may include claims that should be separately classified from Indirect PI Trust Claims and contends that such claims should be given treatment at least as favorable as Class 9 General Unsecured Claims. OneBeacon America Insurance Company, Seaton Insurance Company and various other parties contend that their respective claims should be classified, either in whole or in part, as Class 9 General Unsecured Claims, as opposed to Class 6 Indirect PI Trust Claims. In the event that such Holders file the appropriate Voting Motion or as otherwise ordered by the Bankruptcy Court, the Debtors shall report to the Bankruptcy Court in connection with the Confirmation Hearing the tabulation of votes for all Claims using both (a) the classification of these Claims as Class 6 Asbestos PI Claims as outlined in the Plan and (b) the classification of these Claims as requested in the Voting Motions.

Further, under the Plan, the Debtors and the Insurance Contributors are transferring all Asbestos Insurance Rights to the Asbestos PI Trust. However, the Debtors are not transferring any alleged rights of other parties, such as BNSF which has claimed that the Debtors obtained separate insurance for BNSF and/or named BNSF as an additional insured under the Debtors' policies which may provide BNSF coverage for the Claims being asserted against BNSF by the Libby Claimants as outlined above. Notwithstanding the aforementioned transfer and non-transfer of rights, BNSF will be prohibited by the Asbestos PI Channeling Injunction and/or the Asbestos Insurance Entity Injunction from pursuing any existing rights it may have to coverage

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

for Asbestos PI Claims under the Asbestos Insurance Policies against any Asbestos Insurance Entity.

A few creditors have objected to the Voting Procedures based upon the designation of the value of Indirect Asbestos PI Claims at \$1.00. The Debtors believe that this aspect of the Voting Procedures is consistent with what the Bankruptcy Court has approved previously in other asbestos-related chapter 11 cases for similar contingent and unliquidated claims. In addition, the nominal valuation ascribed to Indirect Trust Claims for voting purposes is appropriate and is consistent with the typical treatment of such contingent and unliquidated claims under the Bankruptcy Code in non-asbestos cases. Lastly, the Debtors are aware of no other reliable method of valuing these claims. To the extent that a Class 6 Indirect PI Trust Claimant disagrees with the \$1.00 valuation of its claim for voting purposes only, that Claimant may file a Rule 3018 motion in accordance with the Voting Procedures. Further, in the event that the Claim of a Holder of an Indirect PI Trust Claim has in fact been liquidated and allowed, the Holder Shall be entitled to vote the allowed amount of such Claim.

3.2.5.3 Indirect PD Trust Claims

Pursuant to the Plan, any Claims asserted against the Debtors for reimbursement, indemnification, subrogation or contribution on account of damages such Claimants have paid or may pay to the plaintiffs for an Asbestos PD Claim or any Claim with respect to any insurance settlement agreement, surety bond, letter of credit or other financial assurance issued by, or entered into, any Entity on account of, or with respect to, an Asbestos PD Claim are Indirect PD Trust Claims. These Claims include the contingent claim of St. Paul Companies related to an appeal bond posted for the *Solow Asbestos* PD Claim currently stayed on appeal(see footnote 17 herein.)

Pursuant to the Plan, Allowed Asbestos PD Claims, including Allowed Indirect PD Trust Claims, shall be paid in full, in Cash, by the Asbestos PD Trust pursuant to the terms of the Asbestos PD Trust Agreement. The Plan also provides that, in connection with confirmation, the Bankruptcy Court shall enter the PD Case Management Order setting forth procedures for determining the allowance or disallowance of Unresolved Asbestos PD Claims.

On the Effective Date, all Claims against the Debtors shall be discharged and all Asbestos PD Claims, including Indirect PD Trust Claims, will be channeled to the Asbestos PD Trust. A permanent injunction under sections 524(a) and 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code shall prohibit the commencement or continuation of an action, the employment of process or an act to collect, recover or offset any such debt as a personal liability of the Debtor (see Section 8.1.3 of the Plan). Likewise, pursuant to the Asbestos PD Channeling Injunction, the sole recourse of the Holder of an Asbestos PD Claim shall be to the Asbestos PD Trust and such Holder shall have no right whatsoever to assert its Asbestos PD Claim against the Debtors, Reorganized Debtors or any other Asbestos Protected Party or any property interest of the Debtors, the Reorganized Debtors or any other Asbestos Protected Party.

3.2.5.4 Enjoining Bond Payments by National Union

The Debtors filed an adversary proceeding entitled *W. R. Grace & Co.-Conn. v. National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, P.A., et al.* (Adv. Pro. No. 02-01657), on

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

January 18, 2002, whereby they sought to enjoin National Union Fire Insurance Company (“National Union”), the issuer of surety bonds to the Debtors, from making any payment under the bonds in connection with two settlement protocols relating to certain asbestos personal injury litigation. On May 13, 2002, the Bankruptcy Court approved an interim settlement agreement, under which: (a) payment under one of the bonds was permanently enjoined, (b) a single payment of \$9,729,720.00 was authorized under the second bond, and (c) a letter of credit posted by Bank of America was permitted to be drawn on by National Union in that same amount, which letter of credit was obtained by the Debtors to secure the bonds. The Bankruptcy Court retained jurisdiction concerning the remainder of this dispute. National Union then paid \$9,729,720.00, and it drew that same amount from the Bank of America letter of credit.

After further litigation, on December 4, 2007, the Court entered an order approving a settlement agreement among the parties whereby (a) National Union, under its surety obligation, agreed to pay a portion of the remaining payment under the settlement protocols on certain of the settled Asbestos PI Claims in the total amount of \$15,350,000; (b) upon payment of the settlement amount by National Union, the surety bonds were cancelled and the adversary proceeding was dismissed; (c) in order to partially fund the payment of the settlement, National Union was permitted to draw down the remaining amount of \$733,935 on the letter of credit posted to partially secure the bond and to draw on a \$6 million Bank of America letter of credit which had been posted for an unrelated obligation; (d) National Union’s remaining claim under the bond for the settlement payment, fees and surety premiums was allowed as an unsecured Claim in the approximate amount of \$9 million; and (e) the claims of the settled Asbestos PI Claimants were disallowed and expunged.

The Claims of National Union with respect to the surety bonds (which are now owned by Longacre Master Fund Ltd.) and the Claims of Bank of America, N.A. with respect to the letters of credit (which are now owned by Morgan Stanley Senior Funding and Tempo Master Fund LP) are Indirect Asbestos PI Trust Claims as discussed in Section 3.2.5.2 above.

3.2.6 Extension of Exclusivity Period and Termination of Exclusivity Period

Through the course of the Chapter 11 Cases, the Bankruptcy Court extended the Debtors’ exclusive right to file a chapter 11 plan nine separate times. On September 11, 2006, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order extending the Debtors’ exclusivity through the anticipated end of the estimation process, and specifically to the July 2007 omnibus hearing. Counsel for the asbestos committees and for the Asbestos PI FCR filed a Notice of Appeal in the District Court (District Court of Delaware Case No. 06-689). On January 23, 2007, District Judge Buckwalter issued a two page Memorandum & Order affirming Judge Fitzgerald’s decision extending exclusivity. The asbestos committees and the Asbestos PI FCR then appealed Judge Buckwalter’s decision to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals (Third Circuit Case No. 07-1344 and 1378).

While the Third Circuit appeal was pending, on June 18, 2007, the Debtors moved for another extension of exclusivity. On July 26, 2007, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order denying the Debtors’ request and terminating exclusivity. As a result, the asbestos committees and the Asbestos PI FCR dismissed their appeal with the Third Circuit. On November 5, 2007,

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

the Asbestos PI FCR and Asbestos PI Committee filed their own chapter 11 plan premised upon a finding that the Debtors' liability for asbestos personal injury claims is equal to or exceeds \$4 billion, but no Disclosure Statement or other exhibits were filed in conjunction with their plan and no hearings were set with respect to it.

3.2.7 Motions to Lift the Automatic Stay

Throughout the Chapter 11 Cases, various parties have filed motions to lift the Debtors' automatic stay. The Debtors have successfully opposed efforts to modify the stay where the respective Claims would be payable out of assets that would otherwise be available for the payment of Claims. In certain situations, the Debtors have consented to modifications of the stay to (a) establish the amount of certain Claims, or (b) where the Claimants sought to proceed only against the Debtors' insurance, and, in the Debtors' estimation, any potential recovery from such insurance would not affect the amount of insurance available to pay other Claimants.

The Bankruptcy Court in the Chapter 11 Cases with the Debtors' consent lifted the automatic stay with regard to the following matters: (a) *CCHP, Inc. v. United States*, United States Court of Federal Claims, No. 99-158 T; (b) *Zapata v. W. R. Grace & Co.-Conn.*, S.D. Fla., Case No. 95-2420-CIV (Middlebrooks); (c) *Interfaith Community Org., et al. v. Honeywell Int'l Inc., Roned Realty of Jersey City, Inc., W. R. Grace & Co., et al.*, Case No. 95-2097 (DMC) (the "ICO Action"); and (d) *Hackensack Riverkeeper, Inc. v. Honeywell Int'l Inc.*, Case No. 00-1451 (JAG) (the "Riverkeeper Action"), to the extent such action does not raise new claims which have not been raised in the related ICO Action. To the extent new claims are raised, the Riverkeeper Action remains stayed. In addition, the Debtors agreed to a lifting of the stay to permit the case of *Kane v. Walt Disney World Co., et al.*, Cir. Ct. Orange City., Florida, Case No. CI-00-6803, to proceed and the Debtors have agreed to non-party discovery in *City of Everett v. Barletta Engineering Corp., et al.*, Massachusetts Superior Court, Middlesex Division, Case No. 00-4884, where the fourth-party defendant has asserted a potential claim against the Debtors.

The Debtors have also sought and received modification from the automatic stay so that they may commence tax court litigation to resolve certain tax claims (Docket No. 15369).

3.2.8 Certain Post-Petition Litigation Matters

3.2.8.1 Litigation Related to the Debtors' Savings and Investment Plan

In June 2004, a purported class action complaint (*Evans v. Akers et al.*) for violations of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA") was filed in Massachusetts federal district court against the Parent's Board of Directors, certain current and former officers and employees of the Debtors, and others, relating to the Debtors' 401(k) Savings and Investment Plan (the "S&I Plan"). The *Evans* complaint alleges that the decline in the price of Parent Common Stock from July 1999 through February 2004 resulted in significant losses to S&I Plan participants. The *Evans* complaint further alleges that the defendants breached their fiduciary duties under ERISA by failing to sell or take other appropriate action with regard to Parent Common Stock held by the S&I Plan during that period, and by failing to disclose to S&I Plan participants the risk of investing in Parent Common Stock. The *Evans* complaint seeks compensatory damages for the S&I Plan from the defendants. On December 6, 2006, the

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

Massachusetts federal district court dismissed the *Evans* claims, on grounds that the *Evans* plaintiffs (former participants in the S&I Plan who had already received their benefits) lacked standing to bring suit. However, on July 18, 2008, the First Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the lower court's dismissal of their claims and remanded the case to the district court.

In October 2004, a purported class-action complaint (*Bunch et al. v. W. R. Grace & Co. et al.*) for breach of fiduciary duty was filed in the Eastern District of Kentucky federal district court (District Court of Kentucky Case No. 04-218), on behalf of present and former participants in the S&I Plan, against certain of the Debtors, the W. R. Grace Investment and Benefits Committee, the Parent's Board of Directors, certain current and former officers and employees of the Debtors, and others. The *Bunch* complaint alleges that the Debtors and their investment advisors breached fiduciary duties under ERISA by selling Parent Common Stock from the S&I Plan at a distressed price. The complaint further alleges that the Debtors breached fiduciary duties under ERISA by failing to provide adequate supervision over State Street Bank and Trust Company, the investment manager for the S&I Plan that the Debtors retained in December 2003, to determine whether to divest Parent Common Stock held by the S&I Plan. On the Debtors' motion, this case was transferred to the Massachusetts federal district court and consolidated with the *Evans* action described above. On January 30, 2008, the court ruled in favor of the defendants on the *Bunch* action, holding that State Street and the Debtors did not breach their fiduciary duties under ERISA. On February 13, 2008, the *Bunch* plaintiffs appealed the Massachusetts federal district court's decision to the First Circuit Court of Appeals. That appeal is pending.

In February 2008, a purported class action complaint (*Siamis v Akers et al.*) was filed in the Massachusetts federal district court by the plaintiff's counsel in the *Evans* action but with a different plaintiff. The *Siamis* complaint asserts the same claims previously asserted in the *Evans* complaint. On May 15, 2008, the Non-Debtor defendants filed a motion to dismiss the *Siamis* case on the grounds that the complaint failed to state a claim and is barred by the statute of limitations. That motion is pending in the Massachusetts federal district court. On or about August 20, 2008, the *Evans* complaint and the *Siamis* complaint were consolidated by the District Court.

The Debtors expect that they would have an obligation to indemnify the other defendants for any liability resulting from this litigation. The Debtors have \$50 million of employers' fiduciary liability insurance coverage that the Debtors believe would be available to pay liabilities arising out of these lawsuits. Since all of the Debtors' employees who had interests in the S&I Plan during the relevant periods are members of the purported class and defendants McGowan, Norris, Poling and Tarola had interests in the S&I Plan during these periods, they have interests in this litigation that may be adverse to the Debtors.

Pursuant to the Parent's Certificate of Incorporation and By-Laws, the Parent is required to indemnify its directors, officers and employees for any liability arising out of any of these lawsuits. The Parent also has certain contractual indemnity obligations that may be triggered. However, the Parent believes that the allegations in each of the lawsuits are without merit and that any liability arising therefrom would in any event be covered by its fiduciary liability insurance.

Pursuant to Section 8.8.8 of the Plan, the Debtors propose (a) to provide their current and former directors, officers, and employees who are defendants in the above-referenced S&I Plan lawsuits with a full and complete release of all liability associated with any such litigation, and (b) to indemnify such defendants for any costs and/or expenses associated with any such litigation. However, to the extent that plaintiffs in the lawsuits have valid Claims against the Debtors, their pre-petition Claims will be treated as Class 9 General Unsecured Claims and their post-petition Claims will be treated as Administrative Expense Claims under the Plan.

3.2.8.2 The Scotts Company Litigation

On September 2, 2004, Scotts, a former vermiculite customer of the Debtors, filed an adversary proceeding in the Bankruptcy Court (Adv. Pro. No. 04-55083) against the Debtors and certain of the Debtors' insurance carriers, seeking declaratory relief with respect to its alleged entitlement under the Debtors' liability insurance policies. Scotts alleged that it was defending 76 asbestos-related bodily injury cases (involving approximately 4,192 plaintiffs) that were filed against Scotts after the Petition Date. Scotts has also alleged that, to the extent that it is found liable to any of the plaintiffs in such asbestos-related bodily injury cases, it will have an indemnity and contribution Claim against the Debtors. Scotts' adversary proceeding ("Scotts' Adversary") has been temporarily stayed by the Bankruptcy Court. As of June 28, 2008, Scotts indicated that there were 20 open cases pending against Scotts.

Pursuant to the Plan, any contribution, indemnification and/or other state law Claims asserted against the Debtors by Scotts for reimbursement, indemnification, subrogation or contribution on account of damages Scotts may have paid or may pay to plaintiffs for death, bodily injury, sickness, disease, or other personal injuries to the extent caused or allegedly caused by exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products for which the Debtors have liability are Indirect PI Trust Claims and will be treated as outlined in Section 3.2.5.2 above.

On the Effective Date, all Claims against the Debtors shall be discharged and all Asbestos PI Claims, including any such claims that Scotts may have against the Debtors or against any other Asbestos Protected Party (including any Settled Asbestos Insurance Company), will be enjoined and channeled to and resolved by the Asbestos PI Trust. Scotts shall be permanently enjoined under sections 524(a) and 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code against the commencement or continuation of an action, the employment of process or an act to collect, recover or offset any such debt as a personal liability of the Debtors (*see* Section 8.1.1 of the Plan). Scotts contests the right of the Debtors in the Plan to channel certain of its claims against Settled Asbestos Insurance Companies to the Asbestos PI Trust.

Under the Plan, the Debtors are transferring their insurance rights to the Asbestos PI Trust. However, the Debtors are not transferring any alleged insurance rights Scotts may have.

3.2.8.3 Montana Clean Air Act Criminal Litigation

On October 29, 2004, the Debtors received a letter from the U.S. Attorney for the District of Montana informing the company that it was named a target of a federal grand jury investigation involving possible obstruction of federal agency proceedings, violations of federal environmental laws, and conspiring with others to violate federal environmental laws. This investigation related to the Debtors' former vermiculite mining and processing activities in

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

Libby, Montana. By designating the Debtors as a “target” of the investigation, the U.S. Attorney asserted that it has substantial evidence linking the company to the commission of a crime.

On February 7, 2005, the DOJ announced the unsealing of a grand jury indictment against certain of the Debtors and seven former senior level employees relating to the Debtors’ former vermiculite mining and processing activities in Libby, Montana (*United States of America v. W. R. Grace*, Case No. CR-05-07-M-DWM (D. Mont.)). The indictment accuses the defendants of (a) conspiracy to violate environmental laws and obstruct federal agency proceedings; (b) violations of the federal Clean Air Act; and (c) obstruction of justice. The Debtors purchased the Libby mine in 1963 and operated it until 1990; vermiculite processing activities continued until 1992. The grand jury charges that the conspiracy took place from 1976 to 2002. According to the DOJ, the Debtors could be subject to fines in an amount equal to twice the after-tax profit earned from their Libby operations or twice the alleged loss suffered by victims, plus additional amounts for restitution to victims. The indictment alleges that such after-tax profits were \$140 million. The Debtors have categorically denied any criminal wrongdoing and intend to vigorously defend themselves at trial.

In July 2006, the Montana federal district court dismissed a portion of the conspiracy count of a superseding indictment alleging conspiracy to knowingly endanger residents of the Libby area and others in violation of the Clean Air Act. In August 2006, the Montana federal district court granted a motion by the defendants to exclude as evidence sample results that included minerals that do not constitute asbestos under the Clean Air Act. The government appealed these and other rulings to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit Case No. 06-30524). In September 2007, the Ninth Circuit overturned the July 2006 and August 2006 Montana federal district court rulings. In December 2007, the Debtors’ petition for rehearing concerning these rulings was denied. The Debtors appealed the Ninth Circuit’s ruling to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court denied the Debtors’ petition for a writ of certiorari on June 23, 2008. As a result, the case has been sent back to the District Court in Montana which has scheduled a pretrial hearing for January 21-23, 2009 and the trial to commence on February 19, 2009. The trial is expected to last 3-5 months.

The Bankruptcy Court previously granted the Debtors’ request to advance legal and defense costs to the former employees involved in this case, subject to a reimbursement obligation if it is later determined that the employees did not meet the standards for indemnification set forth under the appropriate state corporate law (Docket Nos. 6829 and 7143). The Debtors are unable to assess whether the indictment, or any conviction resulting therefrom, will have a material adverse effect on the results of operations or financial condition of the Debtors or affect the Debtors’ bankruptcy cases.

3.2.8.4 Bank Claims Default Interest Litigation

In response to the Debtors’ proposed term sheet for their joint chapter 11 plan of reorganization, which was publicly disclosed on April 7, 2008, certain Lenders, by their counsel, sought payment on the Bank Claims to include post-petition interest at 100% of the contractual default rate, compounded quarterly, plus facility fees and other fees due, as well as attorney fees and costs, in accordance with the terms set forth in the Pre-petition Credit Facilities. On June 13, 2008, the Debtors filed an objection to the Bank Claims seeking an order from the Bankruptcy

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

Court that post-petition interest at the contract default rate need not be paid in connection with the Bank Claims. (Docket No. 18922). The Debtors took the position that section 502(b)(2) of the Bankruptcy Code did not mandate the payment of post-petition default interest. Moreover, the Debtors argued that default interest was inappropriate both because there has been no determination of the Debtors' solvency and because of equitable considerations, most notably that the Unsecured Creditors' Committee previously agreed in connection with the Debtors' January 2005 plan of reorganization (an agreement modified by those parties in February 2006), to the same post-petition interest rate now provided in the Debtors' proposed term sheet. The Objecting Lenders (Docket No. 19073) and the Unsecured Creditors' Committee (Docket No. 19072), joined by JP Morgan, in its capacity as agent for all Lenders (Docket No. 19074), responded to and opposed the Debtors' claim objection. Those parties argued, *inter alia*, that the Lenders are entitled to post-petition interest at the default rate because the Debtors' equity holders will retain significant value under the Plan, and, accordingly, payment in full, including post-petition default interest, must be paid to the Lenders to comply with the absolute priority rule under 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(2)(B)(ii). Those parties also argued that the Debtors are solvent as demonstrated by the retention of value by the existing equity holders and because no compelling equitable considerations exist, the Lenders' contractual rights should be enforced and payment made of post-petition interest at the default rate. Those parties also argued that the Unsecured Creditors' Committee's agreement to a post-petition interest rate with respect to the Debtors' January 2005 plan was not binding upon the Objecting Lenders and, in any event, such agreement was no longer operative because of subsequent events in the bankruptcy cases.

On or about September 5, 2008, after the parties conducted discovery in relation to the Debtors' objection, the Debtors filed their Trial Brief (Docket No. 19476), responding to the arguments raised by the Objecting Lenders and Unsecured Creditors' Committee and marshalling the evidence with respect thereto. The Objecting Lenders also filed a Pre-Trial Memorandum on or about September 5, 2008 (Docket No. 19478), joined by the Unsecured Creditors' Committee (Docket No. 19477), reiterating the arguments previously asserted and marshalling the evidence with respect to those arguments. In addition to reiterating the argument set forth in their objection, the Debtors, in their Trial Brief, argued, *inter alia*, that the Lenders are not entitled to post-petition interest at the default rate because the Lenders' claims are not impaired under section 1124 of the Bankruptcy Code and because there has not been any determination of the Debtors' solvency. Accordingly, the Debtors asserted that neither the absolute priority rule nor the "fair and equitable" test of 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(2) is applicable. The Court held a hearing on the Debtors' objection on September 29, 2008 and the Court's ruling is pending.

3.2.9 Motion for Entry of Case Management Order, the Estimation Hearing, and Settlement of all Asbestos PI Claims

The Debtors filed their motion seeking entry of a case management order, establishment of bar date, approval of proofs of Claim forms, and approval of notice program (the "Original CMO Motion") on June 27, 2001 (Docket No. 586). The Original CMO Motion outlined the Debtors' proposal for resolution of all of the various key issues facing the Debtors, including issues relating to Asbestos PI Claims. The matter was fully briefed and set to be tried before District Judge Farnan on November 21, 2001 when the Third Circuit Court of Appeals

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

reassigned the Chapter 11 Cases, along with the asbestos bankruptcy cases of four other debtors pending in Delaware, to the Honorable Judge Alfred M. Wolin.

Judge Wolin (a) retained the asbestos personal injury issues, the Sealed Air Action and the Fresenius Action (described in detail in Section 2.8.4 in this Disclosure Statement) and (b) referred all other matters to the Bankruptcy Court. Judge Wolin first addressed the fraudulent transfer lawsuits. After extensive briefing and negotiations, the matter was resolved in principle by the parties in November 2002 and will potentially result in payments to the Asbestos PI Trust and the Asbestos PD Trust having an estimated value of more than \$1 billion in the aggregate.

Judge Wolin did not immediately address the Debtors' potential liability for asbestos personal injury claims. Instead, he had the parties re-brief relevant issues and put the matter on hold pending resolution of the fraudulent transfer lawsuit. On June 21, 2002, the Debtors filed a supplemental brief regarding procedures for the litigation of common personal injury liability issues (Docket No. 2275). This supplemental brief provided a detailed summary of the Debtors' proposal concerning (a) the level of impairment that should be necessary for a party to assert an asbestos personal injury claim against the Debtors' estates and (b) procedures for implementing, and the need for the implementation of, a bar date covering asbestos personal injury claims. The District Court never considered the matter.

The Debtors filed a motion on November 13, 2004, seeking to estimate the aggregate amount needed to fund an asbestos personal injury trust to enable the asbestos personal injury trust to pay in full all allowed asbestos personal injury trust claims, and to set an order establishing a schedule and procedures for the requested estimation (Docket No. 6899). Through the estimation process, the Debtors sought to demonstrate that most Asbestos Claims have no value because they fail to establish any material property damage, health impairment or significant occupational exposure to asbestos from the Debtors' operations or products. If the Bankruptcy Court agreed with the Debtors' position on the number of, and the amounts to be paid in respect of, allowed personal injury and property damage claims, then the Debtors believed that the amount needed to fund an asbestos personal injury trust for all Asbestos PI Claims could be less than \$1,613 million.

Concurrently, on November 24, 2004, the Debtors filed a motion with the District Court requesting that it refer jurisdiction over the Debtors' amended motion for entry of a CMO to the Bankruptcy Court. On January 13, 2005, District Judge Buckwalter entered an order referring jurisdiction over the Debtors' amended motion for entry of a CMO to the Bankruptcy Court (Docket No. 7547).

On August 29, 2005, the Bankruptcy Court entered a CMO for estimating liability for pending and future Asbestos PI Claims (Docket No. 9301).²⁵ The Bankruptcy Court ordered that all Claimants with Asbestos PI Claims pending as of the Petition Date (other than settled, but unpaid, claims) complete detailed questionnaires providing information on, among other things,

²⁵ The CMO was amended several times with the last amendment on January 30, 2008 (Docket No. 17941) as modified on March 20, 2008 (Docket No. 18340).

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

their medical condition, including diagnostic support, exposure to the Debtors' and non-Debtors' asbestos-containing products, employment history, and pending lawsuits against other companies. The Bankruptcy Court required questionnaires to be completed and returned on or before July 12, 2006. Approximately 60,000 questionnaires were returned before the July 12, 2006 deadline and approximately 43,000 questionnaires were returned following the deadline. The Debtors reviewed the questionnaires and found that a substantial percentage contained insufficient or incomplete responses. In response to a request by the Debtors to compel the Asbestos PI Claimants to cure these deficiencies, the Bankruptcy Court issued a ruling clarifying the information required of Claimants submitting questionnaire responses and ordered that supplemental responses be completed and returned by January 12, 2007. Approximately 35,000 supplemental responses were returned before the January 12, 2007 deadline.

The Bankruptcy Court also established procedures and deadlines for filing proofs of Claims for asbestos personal injury litigation claims pending as of the Petition Date. In August 2006, the Bankruptcy Court set a bar date for such asbestos personal injury litigation claims. Claimants asserting claims subject to enforceable written settlement agreements dated prior to the Petition Date, which had not been fully paid or satisfied, were required to file proofs of Claim by October 16, 2006. Proofs of Claim asserting approximately 34,000 settled claims were received. Claimants asserting claims that are not subject to such settlement agreements were required to file proofs of Claim by November 15, 2006. Proofs of Claim asserting approximately 100,000 unsettled claims were received.

Trial on the estimation of liability for Asbestos PI Claims began on January 14, 2008 and was scheduled to occur on a total of 20 trial dates between January 14, 2008 and June 4, 2008. However, on April 6, 2008, the Debtors entered into the Asbestos PI Settlement with the Asbestos PI Committee, the Asbestos PI FCR, and the Equity Committee to resolve all present and future Asbestos PI Claims. The settlement contemplated that the Debtors, the Asbestos PI Committee, the Asbestos PI FCR and the Equity Committee would file a new joint plan of reorganization with the Bankruptcy Court reflecting the terms and conditions of the settlement. Accordingly, the estimation trial was suspended and the Plan Proponents have filed the Plan. The Unsecured Creditors' Committee, the Asbestos PD Committee, Sealed Air and Fresenius were not parties to the settlement.

3.2.10 Debtors' Bar Date for Asbestos PD Claims (Excluding US ZAI PD Claims), Non-Asbestos Claims, and Asbestos Medical Monitoring Claims

By an order dated April 22, 2002, the Bankruptcy Court established the March 2003 Bar Date as the last date for filing proofs of Claim for all pre-petition Claims relating to (a) Asbestos PD Claims (excluding US ZAI PD Claims), (b) non-Asbestos Claims (including all governmental Claims), and (c) Asbestos Medical Monitoring Claims (Docket No. 1963).

Approximately 14,900 proofs of Claim were filed by the March 2003 Bar Date. Of these claims, approximately 4,300 were filed as Asbestos PD Claims, approximately 1,000 were filed as Asbestos Medical Monitoring Claims, and approximately 9,400 were generally non-asbestos related. In addition, approximately 800 non-asbestos related proofs of Claim were filed after the March 2003 Bar Date.

Of the 10,200 generally non-asbestos related claims filed, approximately 7,000 involve claims by employees or former employees for future retirement benefits such as pension and retiree medical coverage which the Debtors view as contingent. The remaining claims include claims for payment of goods and services, taxes, product warranties, principal and interest under Pre-petition Credit Facilities, environmental remediation, indemnification or contribution to actual or potential parties in asbestos-related and other litigation, pending non-asbestos-related litigation, and non-asbestos-related personal injury.

The Debtors' analysis indicated that many claims were duplicates, represented the same claim filed against more than one of the Debtors, lacked supporting documentation, or provided insufficient supporting documentation. As of June 30, 2008, of the approximately 3,265 generally non-asbestos non-employee claims filed, approximately 1,855 have been expunged or withdrawn by claimants, approximately 1,140 have been resolved, and an additional approximately 270 claims are to be addressed through the claim objection process and the dispute resolution procedures approved by the Bankruptcy Court.

3.2.11 The ADR Program

On June 12, 2004, the Debtors filed a Motion for the entry of an order establishing an alternative dispute resolution ("ADR") program to liquidate certain pre-petition Claims that were submitted pursuant to the order setting the March 2003 Bar Date. On November 9, 2004, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order approving the Debtors' ADR program, as amended to address concerns raised by the Bankruptcy Court and other parties. The ADR program establishes procedures for resolving certain contested non-asbestos Claims through negotiation and then, if necessary, through mediation.

The Debtors have used the ADR program successfully. On October 23, 2007, the Debtors entered into a stipulation to settle five claims filed by Del Taco, Inc. and certain individuals for a total of \$3,750,000, plus interest from the date of Bankruptcy Court approval. The claims related to the interpretation of certain agreements dating back to as early as 1977. The parties had been in litigation for several years before the chapter 11 filing automatically stayed the litigation. The Bankruptcy Court approved the settlement with Del Taco on December 13, 2007.

3.2.12 The Judge Wolin Mandamus and Recusal Proceedings

On October 10, 2003, certain creditors of Owens Corning Corporation moved to have Judge Wolin recused from any further participation in the Owens Corning bankruptcy cases that were pending before him in the District Court. Shortly thereafter, certain creditors of the Debtors filed a similar motion. On October 30, 2003, the Third Circuit issued an order that stayed all matters before Judge Wolin in each of the five asbestos cases before him, including matters pertaining to the Debtors' Chapter 11 Cases. The cases before Judge Wolin remained stayed, pending resolution of the Wolin recusal matters. The Third Circuit issued a Writ of Mandamus on May 17, 2004 which (a) ordered Judge Wolin to recuse himself from the five asbestos cases before him, including the Debtors' Chapter 11 Cases, and (b) lifted the stay of all matters before Judge Wolin. On May 27, 2004 (Docket No. 5652), the Honorable Ronald E. Buckwalter was assigned all matters in the Debtors' Chapter 11 Cases that were previously pending before Judge Wolin.

3.2.13 Significant Asset Purchases and Dispositions

At various times during the course of the Chapter 11 Cases, the Debtors have either purchased or disposed of certain assets, or otherwise expended assets of the estates or of their non-Debtor subsidiaries. The more significant of these transactions are described herein.

3.2.13.1 Significant Asset Purchases and Investments

- March 2002 The Debtors obtained approval to acquire the masonry admixtures business of Addiment Incorporated for the sum of \$4 million subject to post-closing adjustment for receivables and inventory. (Docket No. 1851).
- August 2002 Advanced Refining Technologies LLC (“ART”), Grace’s non-Debtor hydroprocessing catalyst joint venture with Chevron, purchased a paid-up exclusive license (worldwide except for certain Arab and Islamic countries) of the HOP hydroprocessing catalyst technology and related assets of Japan Energy Corporation.
- April 2003 The Separations Group, a non-Debtor subsidiary engaged in the chromatography columns business, acquired the chromatography columns business of MODcol Corporation.
- August 2004 The Debtors obtained approval to advance funds, not to exceed \$57.9 million to the Separations Group, a wholly owned, non-debtor subsidiary, to acquire the Alltech chromatography business (Docket No. 6009), and has continued its chromatography business under the Alltech name.
- November 2004 The Debtors obtained permission to acquire the Triflex® roofing underlayment product line of Flexia Corporation, a Quebec Company for a sum not to exceed CDN \$6.1 million. (Docket No. 6607). The transaction also included authorization to enter into a contract manufacturing agreement with Flexia whereby Flexia will construct Tri-Flex® products on behalf of the Debtors and authorization to construct a production line for the manufacture of Tri-Flex® products at the Debtors’ Chicago facility.
- July 2005 The Debtors obtained approval to expend up to \$20 million to establish an additional manufacturing facility for the Specialty Building Materials (“SBM”) business of Grace Construction Products. The SBM business was growing at such a pace that the business was projected to outgrow its plant capacity in late 2006. The Debtors constructed the facility on land purchased in Mount Pleasant, Tennessee, and the facility began operations in May 2007.
- August 2005 The Debtors obtained permission to acquire the technology and certain other assets of Single-Site Catalysts, LLC (“SSCL”). (Docket

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

No. 9292). The transaction provided for purchase of SSCL's metallocene catalyst technology and components, related trademarks, inventory, and customer contracts for \$1.5 million, plus payments equal to 3% of net sales of products manufactured using the acquired technology below \$5 million, 8% of net sales between \$5 million and \$10 million, and 5.5% of net sales exceeding \$10 million.

June 2006 The Debtors obtained permission to acquire the assets located in central, New Jersey of a privately held chemical company in order to expand the Debtors' operations in the polymerization catalyst business. (Docket No. 12438). The purchase price was \$20 million, with a post-closing adjustment based on any change in the working capital of the businesses from a specified base amount of \$3.5 million.

June 2007 ART made an investment in the shares of Kuwait Catalyst Company of Shuaiba, Kuwait, a manufacturer of hydroprocessing catalysts.

February 2008 The Debtors obtained authority to acquire a preferred stock interest in CeraTech, Inc. (Docket No. 17859). The transaction consisted of a \$3 million investment plus an option for CeraTech to request, or Grace at its own option to provide, an additional \$3 million investment. CeraTech has developed technology to make products that Construction Products wished to add to its product portfolio. The Debtors and CeraTech also entered into an exclusive sales, marketing and distribution agreement under which the Debtors have the exclusive rights to manufacture and sell products utilizing the CeraTech technology.

3.2.13.2 Significant Asset Dispositions

During the course of the Debtors' bankruptcy cases, there has been only one significant disposition of assets. In August, 2007, the Debtors sold their Washcoat business to Rhodia, Inc. The Washcoat business was a business whereby the Debtors designed, manufactured, and marketed materials used in catalytic converters for automotive and other engines. The Bankruptcy Court approved the motion to sell the business on July 23, 2007 (Docket No. 16374) and the Debtors closed the sale of the Washcoat business on August 1, 2007, realizing proceeds of \$21.9 million.

The Debtors have also from time to time during the course of these chapter 11 cases disposed of other assets valued at less than \$5 million pursuant to the Debtors' Procedures for the Sale and Abandonment of *De Minimus* Assets dated August 2, 2001 (Docket No. 833).

3.2.14 Tax Related Motions and Settlements

3.2.14.1 Tax Related Motions

In order to limit the trading of its shares to prevent a change in control of the Parent for tax purposes, the Debtors filed a motion seeking an order to require notice and waiting periods on transfers of Parent Common Stock to give the Debtors time to review the purchases for tax purposes. The order imposes notice requirements and potential restrictions on stock acquisitions by those persons or entities that (a) currently own 4.75% or more of Parent Common Stock or (b) seek to acquire 4.75% or more of Parent Common Stock. A change in control of the Parent would severely limit the Debtors' ability to use their net operating losses to offset taxes on future income. Under the order, the Debtors have the right to object in Bankruptcy Court to those persons or entities acquiring Parent Common Stock if the acquisition poses a material risk of adversely affecting the Debtors' ability to use their net operating losses. A final order granting the request was entered on January 24, 2005 (Docket No. 7611). This order will terminate on the Effective Date.

On September 17, 2007, the Debtors filed a motion for approval of an Optimization Plan to (a) establish a more tax-efficient global capital structure, that serves as the foundation for chapter 11 emergence financing, (b) reduces foreign cash taxes, and (c) preserves the Debtors' anticipated U.S. federal consolidated net operating losses. The Bankruptcy Court entered an order approving the motion on October 30, 2007 (Docket No. 17216).

On March 17, 2008, the Debtors filed a motion seeking authorization to pay up to \$1.4 million to satisfy certain pre-petition real property tax claims and to stem the continued accrual of interest at the applicable statutory tax rates. The Bankruptcy Court entered an order approving the motion on April 21, 2008 (Docket No. 18579). The Debtors have already made approximately \$1.1 million in payments to resolve four of the largest claims.

3.2.14.2 Tax-Related Settlements

In 1988 and 1989, the Debtors acquired COLI policies on the lives of certain employees as part of a strategy to fund the cost of postretirement employee health care benefits and other long-term liabilities. COLI premiums were funded in part by loans issued against the cash surrender value of the COLI policies and the Debtors claimed a total of approximately \$258 million in deductions attributable to interest accrued on such loans though the 1998 tax year, after which such deductions were no longer permitted by law. The IRS challenged the deductions of interest for years prior to 1999. In 2000, the Debtors paid \$21.2 million of tax and interest related to this issue for the tax years 1990 through 1992. Subsequent to 1992, the Debtors deducted approximately \$163.2 million in interest attributable to the COLI policy loans. On October 13, 2004, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order authorizing Grace to enter into a settlement agreement with the IRS that provided that the government allowed 20% of the aggregate amount of the COLI interest deductions and that the Debtors owed federal income tax and interest with respect to the remaining 80% of the COLI interest deductions disallowed (Docket No. 6606). This settlement agreement also provided that, with respect to the termination of the COLI policies, the Debtors included 20% of the gain realized in taxable income, with the government exempting 80% of such gain from tax. On January 20, 2005, the Debtors executed the COLI settlement agreement.

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

On February 14, 2005, the Debtors filed a motion with the Bankruptcy Court seeking an order (a) authorizing the Debtors to enter into a settlement agreement with the IRS with respect to certain issues relating to the taxable years ending December 31, 1993 through December 31, 1994 (the “1993-1996 Settlement Agreement”), and (b) directing the Debtors to pay to the IRS no later than April 15, 2005 the certain taxes owing under the 1993-1996 Settlement Agreement. The 1993-1996 Settlement Agreement resolved all issues for that audit period with the exception of a tax controversy with respect to research credits and research and experimentation expenditures, discussed below. On April 12, 2005, the Bankruptcy Court issued the requested order and on April 14, 2005, the Debtors made a tax payment in the amount of \$90 million under the 1993-1996 Settlement Agreement.

The IRS asserted approximately \$62 million of additional federal income tax withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) taxes plus interest and related penalties against one of the Debtors’ subsidiaries that operated a temporary health care staffing business until its sale in 1999. The IRS contended that certain per diem reimbursements made by the business should have been treated as wages subject to employment taxes and federal income tax withholding. The Debtors contended that the per diem and expense allowance plans were in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements, as well as other published guidance from the IRS. On September 18, 2006, the Debtors filed a motion seeking to settle these claims in the amount of \$13 million, which settlement was approved by the Bankruptcy Court on October 30, 2006 (Docket No. 13513).

In 1999, Grace and de maximis, inc. (“de maximis”), an environmental project management company, formed a special purpose environmental remediation management joint venture, Remedium Group, Inc. (“Remedium”), to centralize, manage and minimize environmental expenditures associated with certain Grace remediation sites. The joint venture was created by virtue of de maximis acquiring Remedium Class B stock. Grace reported a \$128.6 million capital loss from that sale. In September 2004, the IRS concluded that Grace’s capital loss should be disallowed but that no penalties should be imposed. On January 18, 2008, the Debtors filed a motion seeking authority to settle this matter with the IRS whereby the Debtors would be allowed a capital loss in the amount of \$32.15 million or 25%, in lieu of the \$128.6 million capital loss that they originally claimed on its 1999 federal income tax return. The Bankruptcy Court entered an order approving the motion on March 7, 2008 (Docket No. 18247).

On June 16, 2008, the Debtors filed a motion seeking authorization to settle a federal income tax controversy relating to research credits and research experimentation expenditures (R&E Settlement Agreement) claimed for the taxable years ending December 31, 1993 through December 31, 1996. The R&E Settlement Agreement gives the Debtors a significant portion of the research credits in dispute and, if approved, will result in a refund in the amount of approximately \$6.3 million of tax plus interest. The Bankruptcy Court entered an order on July 21, 2008 approving the R&E Settlement (Docket No. 19111) and the settlement has been approved by the Joint Committee on Taxation.

3.2.15 The Tersigni Investigation

On August 24, 2007, the United States Trustee filed a motion for the appointment of an examiner related to the conduct of L. Tersigni Consulting, P.C. ("Tersigni"), former financial advisor to the Asbestos PI Committee in these Chapter 11 Cases and several other asbestos chapter 11 cases. The Bankruptcy Court approved the appointment of an examiner on November 13, 2007 to investigate the billing practices and related conduct of Tersigni to determine whether the Debtors have any cause of action against Tersigni. On November 19, 2007, Tersigni filed for chapter 11 bankruptcy protection in Connecticut. The Connecticut bankruptcy judge appointed Hugh M. Ray of Andrews Kurth LLP as examiner in the chapter 11 case. The examiner is responsible for investigating both whether the various asbestos debtors have any causes of action against Tersigni as well as whether Tersigni is owed any money by the various asbestos debtors, including the Debtors. Although the Connecticut bankruptcy court also authorized Mr. Ray to act as a mediator, the Debtors elected to negotiate directly with Tersigni to resolve their claims. The Debtors have reached an agreement to settle those claims for a reimbursement to the Debtors in an amount approximating 11% of the fees previously paid to Tersigni. The agreement has been approved by both the Connecticut bankruptcy court and the Bankruptcy Court.

3.2.16 Various Additional Claim Settlements During the Course of the Chapter 11 Cases

On May 12, 2005, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order approving a settlement agreement and a remediation agreement concerning the Hatco site in New Jersey and approving an associated professional service agreement. Under this settlement, the Hatco claim against the Debtors in the amount of \$34 million was settled through a liability transfer program under which, in exchange for a one-time payment of \$21,353,794, a third-party environmental contractor assumed in perpetuity the Debtors' and others' environmental remediation and environmental legal liability in connection with a site in the State of New Jersey formerly owned and operated by the Debtors.

On July 7, 2005, the Bankruptcy Court entered an Order approving a settlement Agreement with Cytec Industries, Inc. ("Cytec") and Wyeth Holdings Corporation ("Wyeth"). Under the settlement agreement, Cytec, for itself and as indemnitor for Wyeth, committed to pay the Debtors \$5.25 million in settlement of liability for remediation costs at property now owned by the Debtors in Concord, Massachusetts, but formerly owned by Wyeth's predecessor, American Cyanamid & Chemical Corporation. The settlement agreement was structured whereby the first million dollars was paid immediately upon approval of the agreement, and the remaining \$4.25 million was placed into a qualified settlement fund to be held in trust, and used by the Debtors to pay or reimburse response costs and fees with respect to the investigation and remediation of the property. The full \$5.25 million was paid to the Debtors as of November 27, 2007.

On November 14, 2005, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order authorizing the Debtors to settle certain claims filed by Bank of America N.A. ("Bank of America") in the Debtors' Chapter 11 cases. By this stipulation, the Debtors agreed to allow Bank of America's unsecured claim, in the amount of \$9,779,720, representing drawn amounts on certain letters of credit and recognizing its contingent non-priority claim, in the amount of \$8,650,110, representing undrawn amounts under certain outstanding letters of credit. Under the agreement and, in the event any of

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

the outstanding letters of credit are drawn, the amount drawn would be added to the allowed claim, and the contingent claim amount would be so reduced. In late December 2007, letters of credit in the amount of \$6,710,110 were drawn by National Union pursuant to the Settlement Agreement discussed in Section 3.2.5.2 *supra*. As a result, Bank of America now has an additional allowed liquidated claim of \$6,710,110 for those drawn letters of credit.

On September 25, 2007, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order authorizing the Debtors to enter into a settlement agreement with Continental Casualty Company (“CCC”). Pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreement, CCC agreed to pay nearly \$4 million to certain claimants who had filed non-asbestos fireproofing claims against the Debtors and the Debtors agreed to pay the remaining portion of the claims due to the deductibles under the CCC insurance policy (Docket No. 16912).

On August 26, 2008, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order authorizing the Debtors to enter into certain settlement agreements with Weja Inc., Sunrich, Shell and Sunoco, among others. Pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreements, the Debtors are receiving \$1,130,000 to compensate the Debtors for certain response costs pursuant to claims asserted under the New Jersey Spill Compensation and Control Act and common law, and for leasehold damages (Docket No. 19374).

The Debtors entered into additional non-asbestos related settlements. A discussion of these settlements is included in Sections 2.8.1.1 and 2.8.2 *supra*.

3.2.17 Various Motions Filed on an Annual Basis

During the course of these Chapter 11 Cases, the Debtors have periodically filed motions for authorization to make legally required minimum contributions to the Debtors’ defined benefit pension plans covering the Debtors’ employees. The latest in the series of these motions was filed on May 19, 2008 (Docket No. 18746) and was approved on June 18, 2008 (Docket No. 18943). The Debtors have sought and received authority to make contributions in the amount of approximately \$48.5 million in 2003, \$20 million in 2004, \$24.1 million in 2005, \$101.4 million in 2006, \$76 million in 2007, \$32.7 million for the period from January 1, 2008 to July 14, 2008; and \$24.0 million for the period from July 15, 2008 to January 15, 2009.

Also during the course of these Chapter 11 Cases, the Debtors have periodically filed motions for authorization to implement the Debtors’ Long Term Incentive Plan for certain key employees, as part of a continuing long-term, performance-based incentive compensation program for key employees. The latest in the series of these motions was with respect to the 2008-2010 Long Term Incentive Plan, which was approved on August 26, 2008 (Docket No. 19375).

3.2.18 Previous Plans

On November 13, 2004 the Debtors filed the Debtors’ Plan of Reorganization (Docket No. 6895), Disclosure Statement for the Debtors’ Plan of Reorganization Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (Docket No. 6896) and various related documents, including a Motion for Entry of An Order Approving Solicitation and Confirmation Procedures and Schedule (Docket No. 6900) (the “Previous Confirmation Procedures Motion”). On January

13, 2005 the Debtors filed their Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization (Docket No. 7560) and Amended Disclosure Statement for the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (Docket No. 7559). On November 5, 2007, the Asbestos PI Committee and Asbestos PI FCR filed their Plan of Reorganization Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code of the Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants and the Future Claimants' Representative for W. R. Grace & Co. et al., Dated as of November 5, 2007 (Docket No. 17306) (collectively the "Previous Plans"). The current Plan, Disclosure Statement and related documents supersede all of the Previous Plans and the Previous Confirmation Procedures Motion.

3.3 The Canadian Proceedings

3.3.1 General Information

Although the Debtors' Canadian operating subsidiary Grace Canada, Inc. ("Grace Canada") is not a Debtor, the Debtors believed that Grace Canada could potentially become subject to asbestos-related Claims. Accordingly, the Debtors sought and obtained ancillary relief in Canada with respect to Grace Canada.

On April 4, 2001, the Canadian Court granted Grace Canada an order (the "Canadian Order"), pursuant to section 18.6(4) of the Canadian Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985 c.C-36, as amended ("CCAA"), which, among other things (a) recognized the Chapter 11 Cases in Canada as foreign proceedings under the CCAA, (b) prohibited the commencement or continuation of any asbestos-related suits against Grace Canada, and (c) appointed Pierre Le Bourdais as Grace Canada's Information Officer. The Information Officer is responsible for submitting interim information reports to the Canadian Court which address the Chapter 11 Cases, Grace Canada, and the development of any process for dealing with asbestos claims. On February 8, 2006, the Canadian Court granted an order discharging Mr. Le Bourdais as Information Officer and appointing Mr. Richard Finke as the new Information Officer of Grace Canada.

3.3.2 Notice of the Canadian Proceedings

In accordance with the terms of the Canadian Order, Grace Canada published notice of the Canadian proceedings in newspapers of national circulation in Canada on each of April 11 and April 12, 2001. These notices (a) advised Entities of the Chapter 11 Cases and the Canadian proceedings, (b) stated that Grace Canada could seek further relief from the Canadian Court to ensure fair and equal access for Canadians with Asbestos Claims against Grace Canada, and (c) instructed any Entity who wished to be made a party to the Canadian proceedings to contact counsel to Grace Canada. The parties to the service list are as follows:

- Ernst & Young Inc., financial advisor to The Attorney General of Canada (Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada);
- Aikins, MacAulay & Thorvaldson LLP, solicitors for Raven Thundersky and Rebecca Bruce;

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

- Lauzon Bélanger S.E.N.C., co-solicitors for Association Des Consommateurs Pour La Qualité Dans La Construction and Jean-Charles Dextras;
- Scarfone Hawkins LLP, co-solicitors for Association Des Consommateurs Pour La Qualité Dans La Construction and Jean-Charles Dextras;
- Department of Justice Canada, solicitors for Health Canada; and
- Merchant Law Group, counsel for various plaintiffs in proposed class action proceedings in the Federal Court, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia, against the Debtors and others.

3.3.3 Quarterly Reports

In accordance with the terms of the Canadian Order, the Information Officer has filed twenty-six (26) quarterly reports with the Canadian Court. These reports have provided the Canadian Court with a description of matters affecting Grace Canada, as well as provided a summary of all material events taking place in the Chapter 11 Cases. Through these reports, the Information Officer has kept the Canadian Court informed as to the Debtors' reorganization process.

3.3.4 Court Orders in the Canadian Proceedings

Since the date of the Canadian Order, Grace Canada has appeared before the Canadian Court on numerous occasions and has received approval or recognition of a number of orders granted in the United States in connection with the Chapter 11 Cases. The following represents a summary of material matters approved by the Canadian Court:

- Since the date of the initial order, Grace Canada has, from time to time, applied to have the stay extended. The stay currently expires on April 1, 2009;
- On December 5, 2002, the Canadian Court granted an order recognizing the Bankruptcy Court's March 2003 Bar Date Order with respect to claims in Canada in accordance with its terms;
- On November 14, 2005, the Canadian Court recognized in Canada the modified preliminary injunction issued in Adv. Pro. No. 01-771 in accordance with its terms. The effect of the order was to, among other things, stay ten separate class actions asserting CDN ZAI Claims which had been commenced in Canada against Grace Canada, certain of the Debtors' affiliated entities, and certain third parties including Sealed Air Canada. The order also stayed the CDN ZAI Claims against the Crown. The Crown had been named as a defendant in the class action lawsuits; and
- On February 8, 2006, the Canadian Court granted an order appointing Lauzon Belanger S.E.N.C.R.L. and Scarfone Hawkins LLP collectively as CCAA Representative Counsel on behalf of Canadian claimants who assert CDN ZAI Claims and appointing Mr. Richard C. Finke as the new Information Officer.

3.3.4.1 Orders Extending the Stay of Proceedings in Canada

The stay of proceedings granted in the Canadian Order was originally set to expire on October 1, 2001. The Canadian Court has extended this deadline. The current stay of proceedings will expire on October 1, 2008, unless extended prior to that date.

3.3.4.2 Recognition of the Debtors' March 2003 Bar Date Order

As indicated above, on December 5, 2002, in order to give effect to the March 2003 Bar Date Order, the Canadian Court granted an order recognizing the March 2003 Bar Date with respect to non-asbestos claims, Asbestos PD Claims and Asbestos Medical Monitoring Claims in Canada in accordance with its terms.

3.3.4.3 The Corporate Reorganization Order

On April 14, 2004, Grace Canada applied for, and the Canadian Court granted, an Order (the "Canadian Reorganization Order") approving a corporate reorganization involving Grace Canada and certain of the Debtors. The proposed reorganization contemplated, *inter alia*, that Grace Canada would acquire, for valuable consideration, shares or debt in a number of the Debtors' Latin American subsidiaries with its equity investments replacing intercompany loans and trade credit from the Debtors. The Canadian Reorganization Order was to be effective subject to the filing of a certificate of the directors of Grace Canada that they were satisfied that Grace Canada was receiving true value on a reasonable and realistic basis in respect of the assets being acquired. Grace Canada has now received the results of the appraisals for the property to be acquired and is in the process of reviewing and considering the results. The certificate of the directors of Grace Canada has not yet been filed and, accordingly, the Canadian Reorganization Order is not yet effective.

3.3.5 Pre-petition Canadian Lawsuits

3.3.5.1 Canadian Asbestos Personal Injury Lawsuits

On the Petition Date, there were no Canadian asbestos personal injury lawsuits pending against the Canadian Entities or any of the Debtors. All of the 44 asbestos personal injury lawsuits that were filed pre-petition in Canada against certain of the Debtors and the Canadian Entities were dismissed.

In addition to these lawsuits, there were also hundreds of lawsuits filed in the early 1990s in Texas state court involving Canadian plaintiffs. Under Canadian law, a provincial workers' compensation agency who pays benefits is subrogated to the workers' rights against third parties for work related injuries. Liberal Texas venue rules at that time allowed these cases to be filed in the Texas state courts. The Debtors believe that these lawsuits were either settled or dismissed.

3.3.5.2 Asbestos Property Damage Claims for Buildings Located in Canada

On the Petition Date, there were no Canadian asbestos property damage lawsuits pending against the Canadian Entities or any of the Debtors. Approximately 24 asbestos property damage lawsuits were filed pre-petition in Canada against certain of the Debtors and the

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

Canadian Entities. One case was tried and resulted in a verdict in favor of the defendants; most of the remaining cases were settled or withdrawn voluntarily by the plaintiffs. Holders of Asbestos PD Claims concerning Canadian properties filed 439 proofs of Claim in the Debtors' Chapter 11 Cases. The Debtors objected to all of these Claims on a variety of grounds. Most of these Claims have been withdrawn or expunged for the reasons set forth in Section 2.7.2 above. As of June 30, 2008, 55 Asbestos PD Claims concerning Canadian properties remain. All but one of these Asbestos PD Claims are subject to the Debtors' pending summary judgment motion regarding Canadian limitations periods.

3.3.6 Post-Petition Canadian Lawsuits

Between 2004 and 2005, eleven potential class actions were commenced across Canada in relation to the manufacture, distribution and sale of ZAI. Grace Canada, certain of the Debtors and Sealed Air Canada were named as defendants, as was the Attorney General of Canada. Those actions are as follows:

- On October 25, 2004, Raven Thundersky and Rebecca Bruce filed a complaint with the Queens' Bench for Winnipeg Centre against certain of the Debtors, certain of the Debtors' former Canadian subsidiaries, the Attorney General of Canada, and others. The complaint is styled as a purported class-action and seeks recovery for alleged injuries suffered by any Canadian resident as a result of the Debtors' marketing, selling, processing, manufacturing, distributing and/or delivering asbestos or asbestos-containing products in Canada.
- On October 29, 2004, two motions for authorization to institute a class action and to obtain the status of representative were filed by (a) Viviane Brosseau & Leotine Roberge-Turgeon and (b) the Association des Consommateurs Pour la Qualité Dans La Construction and Jean-Charles Dextras in the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec, District of Montreal. The motions seek authorization to institute a class-action lawsuit against Grace Canada, Inc. and the Attorney General of Canada on behalf of (1) every person who is the owner of a building insulated with vermiculite that was marketed under the brand name "Zonolite Attic Insulation" and (2) every person (or their heirs and successors, if applicable) who lives or has lived in a building insulated with ZAI and who has suffered, is suffering or will suffer from asbestosis, mesothelioma, or cancer of the lung.
- Eight additional class actions asserting similar claims to those described immediately above have been filed:
 - *Merv Nordick, et al. v. The Attorney General of Canada, et al.*, Queen's Bench, Regina, Saskatchewan, Case No. Q.B.C. No. 696 of 2005;
 - *Merv Nordick, et al. v. The Attorney General of Canada, et al.*, Federal Court, Regina, Saskatchewan, Case No. T-1503-05;

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

- *Merv Nordick, et al. v. Department of National Defense and Canadian Forces, et al.*, Supreme Court, Vancouver, British Columbia, Case No. L-052352;
- *Merv Nordick, et al. v. The Attorney General of Canada, et al.*, Queen's Bench, Alberta, Calgary, Case No. 0501-07100;
- *Merv Nordick, et al. v. The Attorney General of Canada, et al.*, Superior Court of Quebec, 550-06-00002-058;
- *Ernest Spencer, et al. v. Department of National Defense and Canadian Forces, et al.*, Superior Court of Justice, Ottawa, Ontario, Case No. 05-CV-32367;
- *Her Majesty The Queen In Right of the Province of Manitoba v. The Attorney General of Canada (Her Majesty The Queen In Right of Canada), et al.*, Queen's Bench, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Case No. C1-05-01-41069; and
- *Ernest Spencer, et al. v. Department of National Defense and Canadian Forces, et al.*, Queen's Bench, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Case No. C1-05-01-44628.

On February 8, 2006, the Canadian Court granted an order appointing representative counsel for the plaintiffs in the above actions. The Debtors have retained Ogilvy Renault LLP to represent them in these proposed class actions.

The Crown and the Canadian claimants filed numerous objections in connection with the Debtors' request for the ZAI Bar Date and related motions. *See Section 2.7.3 supra.*

In November 2007, CCAA Representative Counsel brought a motion (the "Representative Counsel Motion") before the Canadian Court seeking, among other things:

- an order lifting the stay of proceedings;
- an order for direction on a protocol for communication between the Canadian Court and the Bankruptcy Court for purposes of facilitating development and implementation of a Canadian Litigation Procedure; and
- an order for direction of the Canadian Court on the establishment of a process pursuant to which advance costs/interim costs can be sought in favour of representative counsel, and for the appointment of a monitor for that purpose.

The Representative Counsel Motion was adjourned on a number of occasions and, on March 26, 2008, due to ongoing settlement discussions, the parties agreed to withdraw the motion without prejudice and without costs. However, settlement discussions subsequently broke down and, on May 15, 2008, CCAA Representative Counsel gave notice of its intention to have the CCAA Representative Counsel Motion heard. Additionally, CCAA Representative

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

Counsel gave notice of a motion seeking the following relief: (a) leave to allow CCAA Representative Counsel to conduct oral and documentary discovery of records and information in the possession and control of the Crown relating to homes in Canada that may be insulated with ZAI; and (b) directions regarding the oral documentary discovery of records and information of the Crown relating to the identity of homes in Canada that may be insulated with ZAI. No date for these motions have been scheduled.

On September 2, 2008, the Debtors, Grace Canada and CCAA Representative Counsel entered into the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement to settle all the Canadian ZAI Claims. The Canadian settlement contemplates, among other things, a claims bar date for Canadian ZAI PD Claims (the "CDN ZAI PD Bar Date"). On October 17, 2008, the Canadian Court approved the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement. On October 20, 2008, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order setting a CDN ZAI PD Bar Date of August 31, 2009, and a notice program, intended to comprehensively reach unknown Holders of CDN ZAI PD Claims, by the Bankruptcy Court. Confirmation of the Plan shall constitute approval by the Bankruptcy Court of the settlement reflected in the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement for all purposes including to the extent required by Bankruptcy Rule 9019. A copy of the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement is Exhibit 9 in the Exhibit Book.

3.3.7 Canadian Claims

Upon confirmation, Canadian Claims related to personal injury, including CDN ZAI PI Claims, shall be channeled to the Asbestos PI Trust along with all Asbestos PI Claims, and shall be resolved in accordance with the TDP. Any Canadian property damage claims related to traditional asbestos property damage shall be channeled to the Asbestos PD Trust and resolved in accordance with the Plan and the PD Case Management Order setting forth procedures for determining the allowance or disallowance of the Unresolved Asbestos PD Claims.

If the Canadian Settlement described immediately above is approved by the Canadian Court, CDN ZAI PD Claims shall be separately classified, channeled to (and paid from) the CDN ZAI PD Claims Fund and resolved in accordance with the terms, provisions, and procedures outlined in the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement. CDN ZAI PD Claims shall not be deemed Allowed or Disallowed, but rather shall be resolved as set forth in the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement.

4. SUMMARY OF THE PLAN²⁶

4.1 Overview of the Chapter 11 Plan

THE DISCUSSION OF THE PLAN SET FORTH BELOW IS MORE DETAILED THAN THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY CONTAINED IN ARTICLE 1 OF THIS DISCLOSURE STATEMENT, BUT IT IS NOT A COMPLETE RECITATION OF THE

²⁶ The section number references in this Article 4 match up one-to-one with the section numbers of the Plan. For example, Section 4.3.1 of this Disclosure Statement correlates to Section 3.1 of the Plan; Section 4.5.1 of this Disclosure Statement correlates to Section 5.1 of the Plan.

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

TERMS OF THE PLAN. MOREOVER, CERTAIN KEY ASPECTS OF THE PLAN ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY BUT ARE NOT REPEATED IN THIS SECTION.

THE DEBTORS HAVE ATTEMPTED TO SUMMARIZE, IN THIS DISCLOSURE STATEMENT, THE KEY PROVISIONS OF THE PLAN, BUT SUCH A SUMMARY IS BY ITS VERY NATURE HIGHLY SUBJECTIVE AND PRONE TO DISPUTE. THEREFORE, THIS SUMMARY IS QUALIFIED IN ITS ENTIRETY BY REFERENCE TO THE MORE DETAILED PROVISIONS SET FORTH IN THE PLAN AND THE EXHIBITS IN THE EXHIBIT BOOK, THE TERMS OF WHICH ARE CONTROLLING.

A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE PLAN IS ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT 1 IN THE EXHIBIT BOOK. HOLDERS OF CLAIMS OR EQUITY INTERESTS AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES ARE URGED TO READ THE PLAN AND THE EXHIBITS THERETO IN THEIR ENTIRETY SO THAT THEY MAY MAKE AN INFORMED JUDGMENT CONCERNING THE PLAN.

4.2 PROVISIONS FOR PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND PRIORITY TAX CLAIMS

Section 2.1 of the Plan deals with unclassified Claims. In accordance with Bankruptcy Code § 1123(a)(1), Administrative Expense Claims and Priority Tax Claims are not classified and are excluded from the Classes set forth in Article 3 of the Plan. These Claims are not considered impaired and they do not vote on the Plan because they are automatically entitled to specific treatment provided for them in the Bankruptcy Code or upon such other less favorable terms as may be mutually agreed upon between the Holder of such unclassified Claim and the Reorganized Debtors or otherwise established pursuant to an order of the Bankruptcy Court; *provided, however*, that (A) Administrative Expense Claims representing liabilities incurred in the ordinary course of business by the Debtors in Possession on or after the Petition Date or assumed by the Debtors in Possession pursuant to the Plan or an order of the Bankruptcy Court shall be paid by the Reorganized Debtors in accordance with the terms and conditions of the particular transactions and any agreements relating thereto or any order of the Bankruptcy Court, (B) Allowed Administrative Expense Claims of Professionals shall be paid pursuant to an order of the Bankruptcy Court, and (C) each Holder of a Claim which by operation of the Fresenius Settlement Agreement is an obligation for Fresenius Indemnified Taxes promptly shall be paid in full in Cash as such Fresenius Indemnified Taxes become due and payable.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Bankruptcy Court, except for Administrative Expense Claims for amounts incurred by the Debtors in the ordinary course of business during the Chapter 11 Cases, the Confirmation Order shall operate to set a bar date for Administrative Expense Claims against the Debtors (the "Administrative Claims Bar Date"), which bar date shall be the first Business Day that is the 90th day after the Effective Date. Claimants holding Administrative Expense Claims against the Debtors not paid prior to the Administrative Claims Bar Date may submit a request for payment of administrative expense on or before such bar date. The notice of confirmation to be served and delivered pursuant to Bankruptcy Rules 2002 and 3020(c) will set forth such date and constitute notice of the Administrative Claims Bar Date. The Reorganized Debtors and any other party in interest will have 270 days after the

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

Administrative Claims Bar Date to review and object to such Claims before a hearing for determination of such Administrative Expense Claims is held by the Bankruptcy Court, *provided, however,* that such time may be extended by the Bankruptcy Court upon request of the Reorganized Debtors.

The Debtors estimate the total of all Allowed Administrative Expense Claims to be approximately \$33.8 million. Of this amount, approximately \$30.0 million relates to the accrual of professional fees and an estimate of other professional fees which will be incurred. The remaining \$1.8 million includes approximately \$1.6 million of administrative environmental Claims and unliquidated amounts of \$25,197 that would be Administrative Expense Claims if and when allowed. The remaining \$112,524 of Allowed Administrative Expense Claims is entitled to interest from the Petition Date at 4.19% per annum, compounded annually.

The Debtors estimate the total of all Allowed Priority Tax Claims to be approximately \$33.0 million, which relates to state tax claims to be paid at emergence.²⁷

The remainder of Article 2 of the Plan delineates in detail the treatment of these unclassified Claims, including treatment of liabilities incurred in the ordinary course of business, fee applications by Professionals and payment of interest to Holders of Priority Tax Claims.

4.3 CLASSIFICATION AND TREATMENT OF CLAIMS AND EQUITY INTERESTS

Article 3 of the Plan deals with classification and treatment of Claims and Equity Interest.

4.3.1 Summary

Claims and Equity Interests are classified for all purposes, including voting, confirmation, and Distribution pursuant to the Plan and pursuant to Bankruptcy Code §§ 1122 and 1123(a)(1), as follows:

4.3.1.1 Class 1. Priority Claims

Class 1 consists of all Priority Claims against the Debtors. Each Holder of an Allowed Priority Claim shall be paid the Allowed Amount of its Allowed Priority Claim plus interest at 4.19%, from the Petition Date, compounded annually, or if pursuant to an existing contract, interest at the non-default contract rate, at the option of the Reorganized Debtors, either (a) in full, in Cash, on the later of (i) the Effective Date or as soon as practicable thereafter or (ii) the date such Priority Claim becomes an Allowed Priority Claim, or as soon as practicable thereafter, or (b) upon such other less favorable terms as may be agreed upon by the Holder of an Allowed Priority Claim. The Debtors estimate that there is approximately \$709,873 of Allowed Priority Claims, plus interest at the applicable rate, if any. This amount includes unliquidated liabilities of \$500,000 that would be Class 1 Claims if and when Allowed. As of June 30, 2008, the

²⁷ Each of these figures in this Section 4.2 is consistent with the Debtors' books and records and includes the Debtors' estimates for certain Claims that are disputed, which Claims may ultimately be determined to be significantly higher or lower.

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

estimated amount of Allowed Priority Claims, including interest, was approximately \$782,607. Class 1 is unimpaired. The Holders of the Allowed Priority Claims in Class 1 are deemed to have voted to accept the Plan and, accordingly, their separate vote will not be solicited.

4.3.1.2 Class 2. Secured Claims

Class 2 consists of all Secured Claims against the Debtors. Each Holder of an Allowed Secured Claim shall be paid the Allowed Amount of its Allowed Secured Claim plus interest at 4.19%, from the Petition Date, compounded annually, or if pursuant to an existing contract, interest at the non-default contract rate, at the option of the Reorganized Debtors, either (a) in full, in Cash, on the later of (i) the Effective Date or as soon as practicable thereafter or (ii) the date such Secured Claim becomes an Allowed Secured Claim, or as soon as practicable thereafter; (b) upon such other less favorable terms as may be agreed upon by the Holder of an Allowed Secured Claim; (c) by the surrender to the Holder or Holders of any Allowed Secured Claim of the property securing such Claim; or (d) notwithstanding any contractual provision or applicable law that entitles the Holder of a Secured Claim to demand or receive payment thereof prior to the stated maturity from and after the occurrence of a default, by reinstatement in accordance with Bankruptcy Code § 1124(2)(A)-(D). The Debtors estimate the total of all Allowed Secured Claims on the Effective Date to be approximately \$5.7 million plus interest at the applicable rate, if any. This amount includes unliquidated liabilities of \$1.7 million that would be Class 2 Claims if and when Allowed. As of June 30, 2008, the estimated amount of Allowed Secured Claims, including interest, was approximately \$6.4 million. To the extent an asserted Secured Claim is Allowed as a Secured Claim, it will be treated as a Secured Claim under the Plan. Class 2 is unimpaired. The Holders of the Allowed Secured Claims in Class 2 are deemed to have voted to accept the Plan and, accordingly, their separate vote will not be solicited.

4.3.1.3 Class 3. Employee Benefit Claims

Class 3 consists of all Employee Benefit Claims. Employee Benefit Claims are all Claims, including accrued but unpaid pension Claims from the Petition Date, for compensation or benefits arising out of Claimants' employment with the Debtors, but only to the extent and amount provided for under a written benefit plan sponsored by the Debtors. Workers Compensation Claims, Asbestos Claims or other Claims asserted by current or former employees are not Employee Benefit Claims under the Plan. Further, any Claim for damages or other relief asserted by a current or former employee that is not for compensation or benefits in an amount permitted pursuant to the Debtors' written benefit plans is not an Employee Benefit Claim. Pursuant to Section 3.1.3 of the Plan, Employee Benefit Claims shall be reinstated under the Plan and paid pursuant to the written benefit plan or plans that the Debtors intend to continue pursuant to Section 9.3.1 of the Plan, subject to the terms and conditions of such plans. Thus, the Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which each such Claim entitles the Holder of such Claim.

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

The Debtors estimate the total of all Allowed Employee Benefit Claims, as of June 30, 2008, to be approximately \$165.3 million.²⁸ This amount includes approximately \$70.9 million of post-retirement benefits other than pensions as described in Section 2.9.3.3 *supra* and approximately \$94.4 million of unfunded special pension arrangements as described in Section 2.9.3.4 *supra*.

All other Allowed Employee Benefit Claims have already been paid pursuant to first day orders of the Bankruptcy Court or will be paid in the ordinary course as they become due. Class 3 is unimpaired. The Holders of the Employee Benefit Claims in Class 3 are deemed to have voted to accept the Plan and, accordingly, their separate vote will not be solicited.

4.3.1.4 Class 4. Workers' Compensation Claims

Class 4 consists of all Workers' Compensation Claims against the Debtors. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which each such Claim entitles the Holder of such Claim. For the avoidance of doubt, in no event shall any of the Sealed Air Indemnified Parties or the Fresenius Indemnified Parties have any liability with respect to any Workers' Compensation Claim. All Allowed Workers' Compensation Claims have been paid pursuant to first day orders or will be paid in the ordinary course as they become due. Class 4 is unimpaired. The Holders of the Workers' Compensation Claims in Class 4 are deemed to have voted to accept the Plan and, accordingly, their separate vote will not be solicited.

4.3.1.5 Class 5. Intercompany Claims

Class 5 consists of all Intercompany Claims. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which each such Claim entitles the Holder of such Claim. For pro forma cash flow purposes, all Intercompany Claims will have no impact upon the Plan as all payments under the Plan are based upon the Debtors and Non-Debtor Affiliates as consolidated. Class 5 is unimpaired. The Holders of Intercompany Claims in Class 5 are deemed to have voted to accept the Plan and, accordingly, their separate vote will not be solicited.

4.3.1.6 Class 6. Asbestos PI Claims

Class 6 consists of all Asbestos PI Claims against the Debtors. All Asbestos PI Claims shall be resolved in accordance with the terms, provisions, and procedures of the Asbestos PI Trust Agreement and the TDP (unless previously allowed pursuant to an order of the Court or agreement of the parties). All Asbestos PI Claims shall be paid by the Asbestos PI Trust solely out of the Asbestos PI Trust Assets as and to the extent provided in the TDP. Asbestos PI Claims shall not be deemed allowed or Disallowed (unless an order or agreement approved by the Court allowing the Claim has been previously entered) but rather, shall be resolved by the Asbestos PI Trust pursuant to the terms of the TDP.

²⁸ This figure is consistent with the Debtors' books and records and includes the Debtors' estimates for certain Claims that are disputed, which Claims may ultimately be determined to be significantly higher or lower.

The sole recourse of the Holder of an Asbestos PI Claim (whether or not such Asbestos PI Claim has been previously allowed pursuant to an order of the Court or agreement of the parties) on account of such Asbestos PI Claim shall be to the Asbestos PI Trust pursuant to the provisions of the Asbestos PI Channeling Injunction, the Asbestos PI Trust Agreement, and the TDP.

Class 6 is impaired. The Debtors are soliciting the votes of Holders of the Asbestos PI Claims in Class 6 to accept or reject the Plan in the manner and to the extent provided in the Confirmation Procedures Order.

4.3.1.7 Class 7. Asbestos PD Claims

Class 7 consists of all Asbestos PD Claims against the Debtors.

Each Holder of an Asbestos PD Claim that is Allowed as of the Effective Date pursuant to a PD Settlement Agreement, or other stipulation, order, or agreement, shall be paid the Allowed Amount of its Allowed Asbestos PD Claim in full in Cash, pursuant to the terms of the respective PD Settlement Agreements, or other stipulation, order, or agreement, by the Asbestos PD Trust pursuant to the terms of the Asbestos PD Trust Agreement. Asbestos PD Claims that are unresolved prior to the Effective Date, other than US ZAI PD Claims, are identified in Exhibit 21 in the Exhibit Book. Such Asbestos PD Claims, together with the US ZAI PD Claims, are known as the "Unresolved Asbestos PD Claims," and shall be paid pursuant to the following procedures: (a) in connection with confirmation of the Plan, the Court shall enter the PD Case Management Order setting forth procedures for determining the allowance or disallowance of the Unresolved Asbestos PD Claims; and (b) Allowed Unresolved Asbestos PD Claims shall be paid in full, in Cash, by the Asbestos PD Trust pursuant to the terms of the Asbestos PD Trust Agreement. All Allowed Asbestos PD Claims shall be paid in full by the Asbestos PD Trust solely from the Asbestos PD Trust Assets. The inclusion of Demands as Asbestos PD Claims and US ZAI PD Claims and any reference to Demands related to Asbestos PD Claims or US ZAI PD Claims in the Plan does not constitute an admission by the Debtors and the other Plan Proponents that an Entity which did not have an allowable US ZAI PD Claim or other Asbestos PD Claim against the Debtors as of the Effective Date could assert a valid claim against the Asbestos PD Trust contemplated under the Plan, and all rights and defenses to the allowance of such a claim by the Asbestos PD Trust are expressly reserved pursuant to the Plan.

The sole recourse of the Holder of an Asbestos PD Claim on account of such Asbestos PD Claim (whether or not such Asbestos PD Claim is Allowed as of the Effective Date) shall be to the Asbestos PD Trust pursuant to the provisions of the Asbestos PD Channeling Injunction, the Asbestos PD Trust Agreement, and any orders entered by the Bankruptcy Court allowing such Asbestos PD Claims.

Class 7 is unimpaired. The Debtors have agreed to solicit the votes of Holders of the Asbestos PD Claims in Class 7 to accept or reject the Plan solely for purposes of section 524(g) of the Bankruptcy Code in the manner and to the extent provided in the Confirmation Procedures Order. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Debtors' agreement to solicit the acceptances of the Holders of US ZAI PD Claims or other Asbestos PD Claims is without prejudice to the Debtors'

right to object to such claims, and seek to disqualify such claims for voting purposes prior to the Confirmation Date.

4.3.1.8 Class 8. CDN ZAI PD Claims

Class 8 consists of all CDN ZAI PD Claims against the Debtors.

All CDN ZAI PD Claims shall be resolved in accordance with the terms, provisions, and procedures outlined in the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement. All CDN ZAI PD Claims shall be paid from the CDN ZAI PD Claims Fund in the manner set out in the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement. CDN ZAI PD Claims shall not be deemed Allowed or Disallowed, but rather shall be resolved as set forth in the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement. Confirmation of the Plan shall constitute approval by the Court of the settlement reflected in the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement for all purposes including to the extent required by Bankruptcy Rule 9019.

The sole recourse of the Holder of a CDN ZAI PD Claim on account of such CDN ZAI PD Claim shall be to the CDN ZAI PD Claims Fund pursuant to the provisions of the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement, the Asbestos PD Channeling Injunction, and any orders by the Canadian Court allowing such CDN ZAI PD Claims.

Class 8 is impaired. The CCAA Representative Counsel shall be entitled to vote to accept or reject the Plan on behalf of holders of CDN ZAI PD Claims in the manner and to the extent provided in the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement and the Canadian Settlement Approval Order.

4.3.1.9 Class 9. General Unsecured Claims

Class 9 consists of all General Unsecured Claims against the Debtors.

Each Holder of an Allowed General Unsecured Claim shall be paid the Allowed Amount of its Allowed General Unsecured Claim plus post-petition interest on such Claim either (a) in Cash in full on the later of (i) the Effective Date or (ii) the date such General Unsecured Claim becomes an Allowed General Unsecured Claim, or (b) on such other less favorable terms as have been agreed upon by the Holder of an Allowed General Unsecured Claim and the Debtors or the Reorganized Debtors. Subject to Section 3.1.9(d) of the Plan, post-petition interest on Allowed General Unsecured Claims shall be calculated as follows: (a) either (i) for General Unsecured Claims arising from the Pre-petition Credit Facilities, post-petition interest shall be calculated from the Petition Date through December 31, 2005 at the rate of 6.09% and thereafter at floating prime, in each case compounded quarterly through the Effective Date; (ii) for General Unsecured Claims arising from Environmental Claims that include a liquidated amount for post-petition or future cleanup liability, post-petition interest shall be calculated at the rate of 4.19% from the date specified in any order allowing the Environmental Claim in such liquidated amount, compounded annually through the Effective Date or the date of payment of such General Unsecured Claim if it becomes an Allowed General Unsecured Claim after the Effective Date; (iii) for General Unsecured Claims arising from an existing contract that specifies payment of interest at a non-default rate of interest, post-petition interest shall be calculated at the non-default rate of interest provided in such contract from the Petition Date, compounded annually through the Effective Date or the date of payment of such General Unsecured Claim if it

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

becomes an Allowed General Unsecured Claim after the Effective Date; or (iv) for all other General Unsecured Claims, post-petition interest shall be calculated from the Petition Date at the rate of 4.19%, compounded annually through the Effective Date or the date of payment of such General Unsecured Claim if it becomes an Allowed General Unsecured Claim after the Effective Date; or (b) on such other less favorable terms as those that have been agreed upon by the Holder of an Allowed General Unsecured Claim and the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, including an agreement whereby no post-petition interest is paid on the Claim or post-petition interest begins to accrue on the Claim on a date other than the Petition Date.

The Debtors' obligations under the Multi-Site Settlement Agreement approved by the Bankruptcy Court on June 3, 2008 (Docket No. 18847) constitute Class 9 Claims, except for those obligations specifically identified therein as Allowed Administrative Expense Claims. The Multi-Site Settlement Agreement is incorporated into the Plan, and the rights of the Settling Federal Agencies and the Debtors with respect to "Debtor Owned Sites," "Additional Sites," "Work Consent Decrees" and "Work Administrative Orders," as defined in the Multi-Site Settlement Agreement, shall be governed by the Multi-Site Settlement Agreement notwithstanding any other provision of the Plan or Confirmation Order to the contrary.

If any Holder of a General Unsecured Claim, other than a Holder of a General Unsecured Claim arising from the Pre-petition Credit Facilities (which Claims are subject to a pending objection and litigation concerning the amount of post-petition interest to which the Holders are entitled) believes that it is entitled to post-petition interest at a rate or calculation other than the treatment set forth in Section 3.1.9(b) of the Plan, such Holder may File with the Bankruptcy Court a "Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice" by no later than the deadline established by the Bankruptcy Court for Claimants to vote to accept or reject the Plan. Any Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice that is Filed shall (a) identify the Claim and the requested rate of post-petition interest applicable to such Claim and (b) attach documentation supporting the payment of such rate of interest for the Claim. Failure to timely File a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice with the required information and supporting documentation will be deemed an agreement to accept the post-petition interest treatment provided for in Section 3.1.9(b) of the Plan. The Debtors shall provide notice of the deadline to File a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice in the manner and to the extent provided in the Confirmation Procedures Order.

The Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, may dispute any Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice by Filing an objection thereto by no later than 60 days after the Effective Date. In objecting to a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice, the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, may assert that the Holder of the General Unsecured Claim that Filed the Post-petition Interest Determination Notice is entitled to no post-petition interest under applicable law or that an amount of post-petition interest less than the amount provided for in Section 3.1.9(b) of the Plan should be paid on account of such Claim, and the Bankruptcy Court may so find in accordance with any such objection asserted by the Debtors or the Reorganized Debtors. If the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, object to a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice, then they shall also assert any and all objections that they may have to the underlying General Unsecured Claim within the same objection notwithstanding the time to file such other objections set forth in Section 5.1 of the Plan.

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

The Debtors shall pay the principal amount of any Allowed General Unsecured Claim to which a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice relates on the Effective Date or on the date on which such Claim becomes an Allowed General Unsecured Claim in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Plan, *provided, however,* that no payment of post-petition interest will be made with respect to any General Unsecured Claim for which a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice has been Filed until the Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice has been resolved in accordance with Section 3.1.9(d) of the Plan. In addition, the Debtors shall pay the principal amount of the General Unsecured Claims arising from the Pre-petition Credit Facilities on the Effective Date, *provided, however,* that no payment of post-petition interest will be made with respect to such General Unsecured Claims until the Debtors' objection in relation thereto has been resolved by a Final Order. Post-petition interest shall not accrue with respect to any General Unsecured Claim after the Debtors have paid the principal amount of such Claim.

At any time, if the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, determine that the post-petition interest rate or calculation asserted in a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice is appropriate, the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, may File a certificate of no objection with respect to such notice (without prejudice to their rights in relation to any other Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice). No hearing is required by the Bankruptcy Court with respect to any Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice for which a certificate of no objection is Filed or to which the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, do not timely File an objection, and the respective amount of post-petition interest shall be paid on the Post-Effective Distribution Date with respect thereto.

If the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, object to a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice and no stipulation or agreement is reached with respect to the rate or calculation of post-petition interest for such General Unsecured Claim, the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, will ask the Bankruptcy Court to schedule a hearing on the particular Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice and the related objection at an appropriate time and shall pay the amount of post-petition interest determined by a Final Order in relation to such Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice on the Post-Effective Distribution Date in relation thereto. All litigation with respect to a disputed Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice shall be conducted in the Bankruptcy Court as claims allowance litigation, subject to the same bankruptcy rules and procedures that would have applied had the litigation been conducted before the Effective Date.

The Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, and the Holder of the General Unsecured Claim that Filed the Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice at any time may enter into a stipulation or agreement as to the appropriate rate or calculation of post-petition interest with respect to such General Unsecured Claim without further action of the Bankruptcy Court and without any prejudice to the Debtors' or the Reorganized Debtors' objections to any other Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice.

Any Holder of a General Unsecured Claim, other than a Holder of a General Unsecured Claim arising from the Pre-petition Credit Facilities, who does not dispute the manner in which post-petition interest shall be calculated as provided for in Section 3.1.9(b)(i)(C) of the Plan, but who wishes to substantiate the existence of an existing contract that specifies payment of interest at a non-default rate of interest as contemplated by Section 3.1.9(b)(i)(C) of the Plan, shall

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

submit a "Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest" to the Debtors' voting and claims reconciliation agent, BMC Group, Inc., by no later than the deadline established by the Bankruptcy Court for Claimants to vote to accept or reject the Plan. Any Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest shall (a) identify the Claim and the non-default contractual rate of interest applicable to such Claim, (b) attach a copy of the contract relating to such Claim and (c) be signed by the Holder of the Claim or its authorized representative under penalty of perjury. A Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest does not need to be Filed with the Bankruptcy Court. Provided that a Holder of a General Unsecured Claim or its authorized representative has not Filed a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice, failure by a Holder of a General Unsecured Claim or its authorized representative to timely submit a Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest will be deemed an admission that no non-default contract rate of interest exists with respect to such Holder's General Unsecured Claim, and said Holder of the General Unsecured Claim shall receive interest as set forth in Section 3.1.9(b)(i)(D) of the Plan. The Debtors shall provide notice of the deadline to submit a Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest in the manner and to the extent provided in the Confirmation Procedures Order.

The Debtors may dispute any Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest by serving a written objection at any time before the Effective Date upon the Holder of a General Unsecured Claim who has submitted a Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest. After a written objection to a Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest has been served, the Debtors or the Reorganized Debtors, as the case may be, and the Holder of the applicable General Unsecured Claim shall negotiate to resolve the objection. If a resolution is not reached, the Holder of the General Unsecured Claim may request a hearing before the Bankruptcy Court to resolve the objection to its Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest, *provided, however,* that such request must be made no later than 60 days after the Effective Date and that the only issue to be determined by the Bankruptcy Court at such a hearing shall be the appropriate amount of non-default contract interest with respect to the General Unsecured Claim, which shall be paid on the Post-Effective Distribution Date in relation to a Final Order making such determination. If the Debtors do not dispute a Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest by serving a written objection upon the Holder of a General Unsecured Claim who has submitted a Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest, then the interest rate contained in the Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest shall govern and be paid.

To the extent that a Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest relates to an Allowed General Unsecured Claim and does not relate to a Claim that is also subject to a Post-Petition Interest Determination Notice, the Debtors shall pay, on the Effective Date or on the date on which such Claim becomes an Allowed General Unsecured Claim, the principal amount of the Allowed General Unsecured Claim to which such notice relates plus post-petition interest at the rate of 4.19% from the Petition Date or, if applicable, the non-default contract rate of interest according to the Debtors' books and records, compounded annually, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Plan pending resolution of any dispute concerning the amount of non-default contract rate of interest asserted in the Notice of Non-Default Contract Rate of Interest. Post-petition interest shall not accrue with respect to any General Unsecured Claim after the Debtors have paid the principal amount of such Claim.

The Debtors assert that Class 9 is unimpaired and that the Holders of the General Unsecured Claims in Class 9 are deemed to have voted to accept the Plan. Notwithstanding the

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

foregoing, the Debtors have agreed to provisionally solicit the votes of Holders of General Unsecured Claims in Class 9 in the manner and to the extent provided in the Confirmation Procedures Order.

The Unsecured Creditors' Committee contends that Class 9 is impaired because the Debtors' Plan impairs the rights of the Class 9 Creditors, as it does not leave the creditors' rights entirely unaltered. For a discussion of the parties' current positions and litigation with respect to the appropriate interest to be paid under the Debtors' Pre-petition Credit Facilities *see* Section 3.2.8.4 above. The Committee argues that the Debtors' Pre-petition Credit Facilities that govern the rights of certain holders of Class 9 Claims call for a payment equal to the Prime Rate plus 2% in the event of default, compounded quarterly. The current Plan calls for Class 9 creditors to receive post-petition rates selected by the Plan Proponents that the Committee alleges have no foundation in the Pre-petition Credit Facilities (6.09% interest through December 31, 2005 and thereafter at the floating Prime Rate compounded quarterly, with no default interest). The Committee alleges that the impairment is impermissible because it results solely from the treatment of the Class in the Plan. In addition, although the Plan now provides for a procedure by which "other" General Unsecured Creditors may litigate the post-petition interest amounts due them, the rights of such creditors are also altered by the Plan. Therefore, under the Plan, the Committee alleges that Class 9 must be classified as impaired. The Debtors and Unsecured Creditors' Committee agreed on the record at the court hearing held on October 27, 2008 that the Unsecured Creditors' Committee's arguments with respect to the impairment of Class 9 are preserved and will be raised by the Unsecured Creditors' Committee as an objection to confirmation of the Plan.

The Debtors contend that Class 9 is not impaired, because all Class 9 Creditors will be paid the full Allowed Amount of their Claims plus post-petition interest as set forth in the Plan. The Debtors assert that any alteration of the rights of Class 9 Creditors is a function of the Bankruptcy Code rather than the Plan itself and thus does not constitute impairment. In this regard, it is the Debtors' position that the amount of post-petition interest provided in the Plan to Holders of Claims arising from the Pre-petition Credit Facilities is all that such Holders of Claims are entitled to as a matter of law and equity based upon the specific facts of these cases. Among the factors that the Debtors believe support their position is that the Unsecured Creditors' Committee previously negotiated, and agreed to, the rate of post-petition interest set forth in the Plan in connection with the Debtors' January 2005 plan of reorganization (an agreement modified by those parties in February 2006). Thus, the Debtors believe that the Holders of such Claims are not impaired. Lastly, the Debtors contend that the Holders of "other" General Unsecured Claims are not impaired, because the Plan provides a mechanism for such Holders to assert their rights, if any, to obtain a payment of post-petition interest in an amount different than that set forth in the Plan.

The Debtors estimate the total of all Allowed General Unsecured Claims (including interest calculated in accordance with the terms above) to be approximately \$1,155.8 million as of June 30, 2008.²⁹ This amount consists of \$500.0 million of principal under the Debtors' Pre-

²⁹ This figure is consistent with the Debtors' books and records and includes the Debtors' estimates for certain Claims that are disputed, which Claims may ultimately be determined to be significantly higher or lower.

petition Credit Facilities and approximately \$305.1 million of accrued interest, approximately \$154.4 million of Environmental Claims, approximately \$27.6 million under drawn letters of credit and other debt (\$24.2 million of principal plus \$3.4 million of accrued interest), approximately \$40.9 million of accounts payable (\$30.3 million of principal plus \$10.6 million of accrued interest) and approximately \$127.9 million of other liabilities (\$67.2 million of tax reserves and \$58.5 million of other accrued liabilities plus \$2.2 million of interest).

4.3.1.10 Class 10. Equity Interests in the Parent

Class 10 consists of Equity Interests in the Parent. On the Effective Date, Class 10 Equity Interests in the Parent shall be retained, subject to the issuance of the Warrant and the terms of the Share Issuance Agreement. Class 10 is impaired. The Debtors are soliciting the votes of Holders of the Equity Interests in the Parent in Class 10 to accept or reject the Plan in the manner and to the extent provided in the Confirmation Procedures Order.

4.3.1.11 Class 11. Equity Interests in the Debtors Other than the Parent

Class 11 consists of Equity Interests in the Debtors other than the Parent. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which each such Equity Interest in the Debtors other than the Parent entitles the Holder of such Equity Interest. Class 11 is unimpaired. The Holders of the Equity Interests in the Debtors other than the Parent in Class 11 are deemed to have voted to accept the Plan and, accordingly, their separate vote will not be solicited.

4.4 MODIFICATION OR WITHDRAWAL OF THE PLAN

Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Plan set forth the Plan Proponents' collective right to modify, amend or withdraw the Plan and/or the Plan Documents, and the effect of any such withdrawal. Section 4.1 provides that after the Confirmation Date, the Plan can be altered, amended or modified but only before its substantial consummation in accordance with Bankruptcy Code § 1127(b). These sections further provide, however, that in no event may the Plan Proponents or any other party amend, modify or supplement the Plan or any other Plan Document in a manner that (a) conflicts with the Sealed Air Settlement Agreement except to the extent that the modification or amendment is expressly consented to in writing by each of Sealed Air Corporation and Cryovac, Inc. or (b) conflicts with the Fresenius Settlement Agreement except to the extent that the modification or amendment is expressly consented to in writing by Fresenius.

4.5 PROVISIONS FOR TREATMENT OF DISPUTED CLAIMS AND ASBESTOS CLAIMS GENERALLY

4.5.1 Objections to Claims (other than Asbestos Claims); Prosecution of Disputed Claims

Section 5.1 of the Plan sets forth the right of the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, and the United States Trustee, to object to the allowance of any Claims, other than Asbestos Claims. Unless otherwise provided for in the Plan or in an order of the Bankruptcy Court, the Reorganized Debtors have up to 180 days after the Effective Date to serve and file

K&E DRAFT DATED 12/19/2008

objections to Plan Claims and may seek additional extensions of their time to object to Plan Claims on notice to all Holders of Plan Claims (other than Asbestos Claims) that are still pending allowance and are not subject to a pending objection. It also delineates the ways in which such objections may be resolved.

Not later than ten (10) days before the Effective Date, the Debtors shall File with the Bankruptcy Court an exhibit listing all Plan Claims (other than Asbestos Claims) that the Debtors have already analyzed and to which the Debtors have no objection (the "Undisputed Claims Exhibit"). Plan Claims listed on the Undisputed Claims Exhibit shall be Allowed Claims as set forth in Section 1.1.4 of the Plan. The Debtors or the Reorganized Debtors, as applicable, may File additional Undisputed Claims Exhibits with the Court at any time after the Filing of the initial Undisputed Claims Exhibit with respect to any remaining Plan Claims (other than Asbestos Claims) if they have determined not to object to any of such Claims.

4.5.2 Resolution of Asbestos PI Claims

Section 5.3 of the Plan sets forth the way in which Asbestos PI Claims will be resolved by reference to the Asbestos PI Trust Agreement and the TDP.

4.5.3 Resolution of Asbestos PD Claims

Section 5.4 of the Plan sets forth the way in which Asbestos PD Claims will be resolved by reference to the Asbestos PD Trust Agreement and the PD Case Management Order setting forth procedures for determining the allowance or disallowance of Unresolved Asbestos PD Claims.

4.5.4 Resolution of CDN ZAI PD Claims

Section 5.5 of the Plan sets forth the resolution of CDN ZAI PD Claims, which will be resolved by reference to the CDN ZAI Minutes of Settlement.

4.6 ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF THE PLAN

Article 6 of the Plan discusses which Classes are impaired and which are not. Each Holder of a Plan Claim or Equity Interest in an impaired Class is entitled to vote to accept or reject the Plan to the extent and in the manner provided in the Plan and the Confirmation Procedures Order. In addition, the Debtors have agreed to solicit the votes of Holders of the Asbestos PD Claims in Class 7 to accept or reject the Plan for purposes of section 524(g) of the Bankruptcy Code as described in Section 3.1.7(d) of the Plan. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Debtors' agreement to solicit the acceptances of the Holders of US ZAI PD Claims or other Asbestos PD Claims is without prejudice to the Debtors' right to object to such claims, and seek to disqualify such claims for voting purposes prior to the Confirmation Date. Further, the Debtors have agreed to solicit and tabulate the votes of the Holders of General Unsecured Claims in Class 9. Whether those votes will be given effect is subject to it being determined that Class 9 is an impaired Class.

Classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11 of Plan Claims and Equity Interests in Debtors other than the Parent are unimpaired. Under Bankruptcy Code § 1126(f), the Holders of Plan Claims and

Equity Interests in such Classes (except for Class 7 with respect to section 524(g) of the Bankruptcy Code) are conclusively presumed to have voted to accept the Plan.

Section 6.5.1 of the Plan deals with confirmation in the event an impaired Class rejects the Plan. Impaired Equity Interests in the Parent and/or impaired Classes of Plan Claims that fail to accept the Plan may be “crammed down” in accordance with Bankruptcy Code § 1129(b). *See also* Section 8.2.1 of this Disclosure Statement for further discussion.

Section 6.5.2 of the Plan provides that if the Plan fails to be accepted by the requisite number and amount of the Holders of Plan Claims and Equity Interests required to satisfy Bankruptcy Code §§ 524(g) and 1129, then, notwithstanding any other provision of the Plan to the contrary, the Plan Proponents reserve the right to amend the Plan; *provided, however*, that in no event may the Plan Proponents amend, modify or supplement the Plan in a manner that (a) conflicts with the Sealed Air Settlement Agreement except to the extent that the amendment, modification or supplement is expressly consented to in writing by each of Sealed Air Corporation and Cryovac, Inc. or (b) conflicts with the Fresenius Settlement Agreement except to the extent expressly consented to in writing by Fresenius.

4.7 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN

4.7.1 Corporate Governance

4.7.1.1 Amendment of Certificates of Incorporation of the Debtors

Section 7.1.1 of the Plan provides that the Certificates of Incorporation of each of the Debtors that is a corporation shall be amended as of the Effective Date. The amended Certificates of Incorporation of the Debtors shall, among other things: (a) prohibit the issuance of nonvoting equity securities, (b) as to any classes of securities possessing voting power, provide for an appropriate distribution of such power among such classes, including, in the case of any class of equity securities having a preference over another class of equity securities with respect to dividends, adequate provisions for the election of directors representing such preferred class in the event of default in payment of such dividends, and (c) effectuate any other provisions of the Plan. The amended Certificates of Incorporation shall be filed with the Secretary of State or equivalent official in their respective jurisdictions of incorporation on or prior to the Effective Date and be in full force and effect without any further amendment as of the Effective Date.

4.7.1.2 Amendment of By-Laws of the Parent

Section 7.1.2 of the Plan deals with amendments to the Parent’s by-laws. The form of the Parent’s by-laws shall be filed as part of the Plan Supplement.

4.7.1.3 Precedence of Share Issuance Obligations

The covenants and agreements of the Parent (for purposes of Section 7.1.3 of the Plan and this Section 4.7.1.3 of the Disclosure Statement, as defined in the Share Issuance Agreement) under Section 5(d) of the Share Issuance Agreement shall take precedence and prevail over any inconsistent or contrary provision contained in the certificate of incorporation or by-laws of the Parent or any of its subsidiaries or in any contract, agreement or other instrument

to which Parent or any of its subsidiaries is a party or otherwise bound (other than provisions, if any, that are inconsistent with, or contrary to, provisions of the Sealed Air Settlement Agreement or the Fresenius Settlement Agreement), and, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, any such inconsistent or contrary provision shall be nugatory and of no force and effect and shall not dilute, restrict, or impair the value or ownership rights of the shares issued to the Asbestos PI Trust thereunder. The issuance of stock to the Asbestos PI Trust pursuant to the Share Issuance Agreement shall not be subject to or trigger any “poison pill,” shareholder or stockholder rights plan, or other anti-takeover or takeover defense plan, contract, agreement, instrument, or provision adopted or implemented by the Parent.

4.7.1.4 Warrant

The Board of Directors of Reorganized Parent shall take all actions necessary so that the Asbestos PI Trust shall not be an “Acquiring Person” within the meaning of the Amended and Restated Rights Agreement, dated as of March 25, 2008, by and between the Reorganized Parent and Mellon Investor Services, LLC, as rights agent (as amended from time to time, the “Rights Agreement”). The Reorganized Parent shall not lower the Beneficial Ownership percentage in the Rights Agreement’s definition of “Acquiring Person” until such time as the Asbestos PI Trust no longer owns the Warrant (either because of its transfer or expiration) or any shares of Parent Common Stock issued to the Asbestos PI Trust upon exercise of the Warrant. No “poison pill,” shareholder or stockholder rights plan, or other anti-takeover or takeover defense plan, contract, agreement, instrument, or provision adopted or implemented by the Reorganized Parent shall apply to or be triggered by the issuance of the Warrant to, or the purchase of, Parent Common Stock upon exercise of the Warrant by, the Asbestos PI Trust.

If, prior to issuance of the Warrant to the Asbestos PI Trust, the Reorganized Parent shall issue or sell any shares of Parent Common Stock, other than Excluded Stock, or any rights to purchase or acquire, or securities convertible into or exchangeable for, shares of Parent Common Stock (including without limitation any (x) options (other than Excluded Options), warrants or other rights (whether or not at the time exercisable) to purchase or acquire Parent Common Stock, other than Excluded Stock, (y) securities by their terms convertible into or exchangeable (whether at the time so convertible or exchangeable) for Parent Common Stock, other than Excluded Stock or (z) options (other than Excluded Options), warrants or rights to purchase such convertible or exchangeable securities), for no consideration or for a consideration per share that is less than the securities exchange average closing price per share of Parent Common Stock for the twenty consecutive trading days preceding (and not including) the last trading day immediately prior to the day of such issuance or sale (the “Market Price”), then and in each such case (a “Trigger Issuance”) the per share exercise price of the Warrant (initially, \$17.00) shall be reduced, immediately upon such Trigger Issuance, to the price determined by multiplying such exercise price by a fraction, (1) the numerator of which shall be (x) the number of shares of Parent Common Stock outstanding immediately prior to such issuance or sale plus (y) the number of shares of Parent Common Stock which the aggregate consideration received (or to be received) by the Reorganized Parent for the total number of such additional shares of Parent Common Stock so issued or sold (or issuable upon exercise, conversion or exchange) would purchase at the Market Price and (2) the denominator of which shall be the number of shares of Parent Common Stock outstanding (or issuable upon exercise, conversion or exchange) immediately after such Trigger Issuance. In the event of such an adjustment of such exercise